

# 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

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Hope of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that a joint convention of both houses be held in the House of Representatives this afternoon at two o'clock for the purpose of listening to an address by the Hon. Benjamin F. Cleaves, chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Maine, on the subject of the reorganization of the Boston and Maine Railroad System, a bill for which reorganization is now pending before the Legislature.

The order received a passage in concurrence.

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to introduce at this time out of order an order simply for the purpose of correcting the appropriation on bill for the year 1915, calling for the return from the engrossing clerk of this bill, and if the bill is returned we will save the cost of the engrossing which is quite an item.

Unanimous consent being given, Mr. Higgins then introduced the following order:

Ordered, That the engrossing clerk be requested to return to this House the appropriation bill for expenditures of government for the year 1915.

The order received a passage.

Mr. Higgins then offered House Amendment A to the bill for the purpose of correcting a clerical error.

The amendment was adopted.

From the Senate: An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 198 of the Public Laws of 1909, as amended by Chapter 192 of the Public Laws of 1911, and as further amended by Chapter 182 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to

amount of the school equalization fund, Senate Doc. No. 326.

In the House this bill was passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate this bill was amended by Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Ricker of Castine, the vote was reconsidered where-by this bill was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion by the same gentleman, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence.

The bill was then passed to be engrossed, as amended.

From the Senate: An Act to promote the industry of horse breeding in Maine and to provide for the registration of stallions, Senate Doc. No. 340.

In the House this bill was indefinitely postponed on motion by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer; it now comes from the Senate, that branch voting to insist, asking for a committee of conference and a committee of conference appointed in that branch.

On motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, the House voted to join a committee of conference.

The Speaker thereupon appointed as such committee on the part of the House, Messrs. Plummer of Lisbon, Pollard of Solon and Peterson of New Sweden.

From the Senate: An Act to incorporate the Oquossoc Light and Power Company, Senate Doc. No. 364.

This bill comes from the Senate amended by Senate Amendments A and B.

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

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf of Portland the House voted to concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment B.

The bill then received its two several readings and was assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading, as amended.

From the Senate: Majority and minority reports of the committee on insane hospitals on Resolve in favor of the Augusta State hospital for nurses' home,

Senate Doc. No. 376, majority reporting "ought to pass," minority reporting "ought not to pass."

In the House on March 24th the minority report was accepted in non-concurrence.

In the Senate on March 25th that branch voted to insist upon its action and ask for a committee of conference, and a committee of conference was appointed in that branch.

On motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton the House voted to join in the appointment of a committee of conference.

The Speaker thereupon appointed as such committee on the part of the House Messrs. Pierce of Houlton, Wasgatt of Deer Island and Edwards of Bethel.

From the Senate: An Act for the protection of life and property against loss or damage from steam boilers or steam machinery operated by incompetent persons in cities of over 35,000 inhabitants, Senate Doc. No. 412.

This bill comes from the Senate amended by Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Libby of Merrill the House voted to concur in the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

The bill then received its two several readings and was assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading, as amended.

From the Senate: An Act to consolidate and revise the laws relating to State printing and binding.

This bill received its two several readings in concurrence and was assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading.

From the Senate: An Act authorizing the towns of Mexico and Rumford, in the county of Oxford, to purchase the toll bridge between said towns erected and owned by the Mexico Bridge Company, House Doc. No. 601.

In the House this bill was passed to be engrossed, and now comes from the Senate amended by Senate Amendment A.

On motion of Mr. Goodwin of Mexico, the vote was reconsidered whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, and on further motion by the same gentleman the House voted to concur

with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

The bill was then passed to be engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

From the Senate: An Act to amend Section 47 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the use of motor boats in hunting sea birds, duck or water fowl, House Doc. No. 640.

In the House this bill received its three several readings and was passed to be engrossed; it now comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Gerrish of Greenville, the House voted to insist and ask for a committee of conference.

The Speaker thereupon appointed as such committee on the part of the House, Messrs. Gerrish of Greenville, Wheeler of Brunswick and Wyman of Kingfield.

From the Senate: Resolve appropriating money for the screening of the outlet of Schoodic lake, in Piscataquis county, House Doc. No. 821.

In the House this resolve received its two several readings and was passed to be engrossed, and now comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ryder of Brownville, the House voted to recede and concur with the Senate in the indefinite postponement of the resolve.

From the Senate: Majority and minority reports of the Portland Delegation on bill, An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 84 of the Private and Special Laws of 1875, entitled "An Act relating to the schools in the city of Portland," majority reporting "ought not to pass," minority reporting "ought to pass."

In the Senate the majority report was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf of Portland, the House voted to concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the majority report.

From the Senate: An Act to establish the offices of superintendent and

matron of the Portland City Home and to determine the tenure of the same. House Doc. No. 734.

In the House this bill was passed to be enacted; it now comes from the Senate indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Roberts of Portland, the House voted to insist and ask for a committee in conference.

The Speaker thereupon appointed as such committee of conference on the part of the House, Messrs. Roberts of Portland, Fossett of Portland and Greenleaf of Portland.

The following resolve was presented and referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs:

By Mr. Lewis of North Haven: Resolve in favor of the clerk, stenographer and messenger of the legal affairs committee.

#### Reports of Committees.

Mr. Sanborn from the committee on judiciary, on bill, An Act to enlarge the duties of medical examiners, reported same in new draft under same title and that it "ought to pass."

Mr. Waterhouse from same committee reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend an Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Madison Water District."

Mr. McCarty from the committee on revision of the statutes, on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 42 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to the appointment of guardians by consent, reported same in new draft under same title and that it "ought to pass."

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

Reports A and B of the committee on judiciary on bill, An Act to incorporate the Grindstone Boom Company, report A reporting same in new draft under same title and that it "ought to pass," signed by Messrs. McCarty, Waterhouse, Campbell, Connellan and Sanborn; report B reporting that the same "ought not to pass," being signed by Cole, Durgin, Connors, Pierce and Butler.

Mr. Campbell of Island Falls moved that report A be accepted.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer both reports were tabled until Tuesday of

next week, pending the acceptance of Report A.

Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches on Resolve relating to the distribution of the proceeds of the issue of bonds for State highways, reporting that the Senate recede and concur with the House, signed by Senators Murphy, Conant and Walker on the part of the Senate, and Messrs. Perham, Pierce and Wescott on the part of the House.

The report was accepted.

The report of the committee of reference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Resolve in favor of physician at the Maine State prison, reporting that the Senate concur with the House on the passage of the resolve to be engrossed, signed by Senators Boynton, Chatto and Fulton on the part of the Senate, and Messrs. Fossett, Millett and Drummond on the part of the House.

The report was accepted.

Mr. Campbell from the committee on judiciary reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act for the better conservation and protection of the public water supply for domestic use and fire protection.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act to provide for the inspection of all public or private hospitals, reformatory homes, houses of detention, convents, asylums, sectarian seminaries, schools or institutions, by the commissioners of the county in which such institutions are situated, by the grand jury thereof, or by any person or persons appointed by a judge of a court record, upon a petition signed by twenty persons of said county.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Resolve to amend Article 22 of the Constitution, relating to limitations of municipal indebtedness, reported that the same "ought not to pass," same subject covered by an other bill.

Same gentleman from same committee, on Resolve to amend Article 22 of the Constitution, relating to limitation of municipal indebtedness, reported that the same "ought not to pass", same

subject covered by another bill.

Mr. Hanson from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought not to pass" on bill, An Act to incorporate the Matamiscoutis Dam and Improvement Company.

Mr. Perkins from same committee, on bill, An Act to define, regulate and control the business of the making of loans or advancements of money in sums of \$300 or less in amount, and to regulate the assignment of wages when given as security for any such loan or advancement, reported legislation inexpedient.

Same gentleman from same committee, on petitions in favor of An Act to incorporate the Northport Village Corporation, reported that the same be placed on file.

Same gentleman from same committee, on petitions in favor of An Act to procure State registration for nurses, reported that same be placed on file.

The reports were accepted.

#### **First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves.**

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

House 923: Resolve in favor of Fred R. Smith of Pittsfield.

House 924: An Act to amend Sections 13 and 14 of Chapter four of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to road commissioners.

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

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

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

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

#### **Passed to Be Engrossed**

Senate 378. An Act to correct certain

clerical errors in and to amend Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to inland fisheries and game.

Mr. Gerrish of Greenville offered House Amendment A, to amend by adding an emergency clause.

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

Senate 292: An Act to correct certain clerical errors in, and to amend, Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to inland fisheries and game.

Senate 390: An Act to authorize the construction of a weir in the tide waters of Cobscook river in the town of Lubec.

Senate 391: An Act to create the Southern Maine Forest District and providing for protection against fires therein.

Senate 399: An Act additional to Chapter 156 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the marking of barrels and boxes to be used in the sale of apples.

Senate 400: An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 22 of the Public Laws of 1909, relating to the licensing of dogs.

(Tabled pending its third reading and assigned for tomorrow morning on motion of Mr. Brann of Winthrop.)

Senate 402: Resolve in favor of E. W. Murphy, secretary of the joint special committee appointed by the 76th Legislature on woman's reformatory, State school for boys and industrial school for girls, for certain committee expenses.

Senate 403: Resolve authorizing the State historian to publish historical matter relating to the history of Maine.

Senate 404: An Act to amend Section 80 of Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 15 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to allowing trust companies to become stockholders in federal and reserve banks.

Senate 405: An Act to incorporate the Mutual Loan Society of Lewiston. (Tabled pending its third reading and assigned for Tuesday of next week on motion of Mr. McCarty of Lewiston.)

Senate 406: An Act to amend Sections 1 and 2 of Chapter 131 of the Public Laws of 1907 and as further amended by the laws of 1913, relating to taxing of insurance in companies not authorized to do business in Maine.

Senate 407: An Act to enable the cities and towns of the State to appropriate money to aid in the erection of memorial building.

Senate 408: Resolve in favor of the Maine State Prison for certain improvements and repairs.

Senate 409: An Act to provide for the establishment of a board of recreation for the City of Portland.

Senate 410: An Act to provide for granting of administration in certain cases without giving bond.

Senate 411: Resolve declaratory of certain amendments of the Constitution of Maine.

Senate 413: An Act to incorporate the Harmony Water Company.

Senate 415: An Act to extend the charter of the Rockland, South Thomaston & St. George Railway.

Senate 417: An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 383 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, relative to the tolls to be charged by the South Branch Improvement Company.

Senate 418: An Act to amend Sections 3 and 4 of Chapter 70 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Spencer Dam Company, as amended by Chapter 195 of the Private and Special Laws of 1911, and in addition thereto."

Senate 419: Resolve appropriating money for the improvement of the State park on the easterly side of State street.

Senate 420: An Act to amend Section 8 of Chapter 130 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to State aid highways.

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

House 899: An Act to amend Chapter 39 of the Public Laws of 1911, as amended by Chapter 26 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the weekly payment of wages.

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

House 903: An Act to amend Section

4 of Chapter 73 of the Revised Statutes relating to notices upon petition for sale of real estate.

House 904: An Act to amend Section 35 of Chapter 101 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the authority of bail commissioners.

House 905: An Act relating to administering oaths required by law.

House 906: An Act to amend Section seven of Chapter 66, of the Revised Statutes, relating to proofs of wills.

House 907: An Act to amend Section seven of Chapter 66 of the Revised Statutes, relating to proofs of wills.

House 908: An Act to amend Section 32 of Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes, relating to petitions for adoption of children.

House 909: An Act to provide for the binding of original papers filed in probate courts.

House 910: An Act to amend Section nine of Chapter 75 of the Revised Statutes, relating to transcripts of examinations or testimony taken in the probate court.

House 911: An Act to amend Chapter one of the Public Laws of 1907, providing for notice to registers of probate of the names of corporate surety companies qualified to do business in the State.

House 912: An Act to provide for the record in the register of deeds of notices waiving testamentary provisions for husband or wife.

House 913: An Act relative to the employment of minors.

House 919: An Act to divide the town of Kennebunkport and incorporate the town of North Kennebunkport.

Mr. Roberts of Portland moved that this bill be laid upon the table and be specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, pending its third reading.

The motion was lost.

The bill then received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the compensation of guardians.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to incorporate the Northport Village Corporation.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relative to ice fishing in Whetstone pond, in Piscataquis county.

An Act to regulate anchorage in the waters of Mooshead lake bordering on Kineo.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 62 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, entitled "An Act to protect cod and other ground fish in waters off the coast of Lincoln and Sagadahoc counties.

An Act to amend Chapter 241 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, entitled "An Act to supply the town of Lisbon with pure water. (On motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, this act was indefinitely postponed.)

An Act additional to Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes relating to the destruction of fish in tidal waters by means of dynamite or poisonous or stupefying substances.

An Act to amend Chapter 356 of the Private and Special Laws of 1883, relating to the construction of a bridge over tide waters between Orr's Island and Bailey's Island.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to fishing in Kingsbury pond, in Somerset and Piscataquis counties, and in the Bennett ponds, in Guilford, in Piscataquis county.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to ice fishing in Barker pond, in Cornville, in Somerset county.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, prohibiting fishing in the tributaries to Ship Pond stream, in Piscataquis county.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, prohibiting ice fishing in Pleasant pond, Mud pond, Horseshoe pond, and Oxbow pond, situated in the

counties of Kennebec and Sagadahoc.

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 ice fishing in the Kennebec river, in Somerset County. (Tabled by Mr. Holt of Skowhegan, and specially assigned for consideration tomorrow morning.)

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 Berry Pond and its tributaries, in the towns of Winthrop and Wayne, in the county of Kennebec.

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 ice fishing in Sand Pond, in Denmark, in the county of Oxford.

An Act additional to Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, prohibiting fishing in Violette Brook, in Van Buren, in the county of Aroostook, above Hammond's mill. (Tabled by Mr. Michad of Van Buren, and specially assigned for consideration tomorrow morning.)

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 in Davis Stream and Monson Pond Stream, in the county of Piscataquis.

An Act to amend Section 39 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 206 of the Public Laws of 1913, relating to the protection of beaver.

An Act to abolish the office of town agent, by amending Section 14 of Chapter four of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Section two of Chapter 213 of the Public Laws of 1913.

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 Jackson Pond, in the town of Concord, in the county of Somerset.

An Act to extend the charter of the Ocean and Northern Railroad Company.

An Act to extend the charter of the Androscoggin Valley Railroad Co.



An Act to incorporate the North Bridgton Village Corporation.

An Act to amend Section one of Chapter 139 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899, entitled "An Act creating the Dixfield Village Corporation."

An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 363 of the Private and Special Laws of 1850, entitled "An Act to incorporate the city of Belfast," as amended by Chapter 272 of the Private Laws of 1909.

An Act to protect the agricultural and horticultural societies against fraud.

An Act relating to the appointment of non-resident guardians.

An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 15 of the Public Laws of 1907, as amended by Chapter 34 of the Public Laws of 1909, as further amended by Chapter 84 of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to the removal of moth pests within the limits of the highway.

An Act regulating the taking of clams in the town of Lamoine.

An Act to incorporate the Madawaska Electrical Power Company.

An Act to amend Chapter 215 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887, entitled "An Act to grant special powers to School District No. 3 in the town of Springfield," and further to amend Chapter 281 of the Private and Special Laws of 1901, entitled "An Act to incorporate the trustees of the Springfield Normal school."

An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 211 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, as amended by Chapter 101 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to the salaries of judge and recorder of the Bangor municipal court.

### Finally Passed

Resolve reimbursing Benjamin M. Jenness for money expended for the burial expenses of certain honorably discharged soldiers of the Civil War.

Resolve in favor of the livestock sanitary commissioner, for the control of contagious diseases among domestic animals.

Resolve in favor of the Webber Hospital Association for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Good Samaritan Home Association for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Protective Society of Maine for maintenance.

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

Resolve in favor of the York hospital for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Young Men's Christian Association hospital of Greenville Junction for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Daughters of Wisdom for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Bar Harbor Medical and Surgical hospital for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Eastern Maine General hospital for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Temporary Home for Women and Children for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Heart Work Society of Maine for maintenance and the carrying out of its work.

Resolve in favor of the Maine Home for Friendless Boys for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Waldo County General hospital for maintenance.

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

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

Resolve in favor of the Old Town hospital for maintenance. (Tabled and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week on motion by Mr. Libby of Merrill.)

Resolve in favor of the Girls' Orphanage of Lewiston for maintenance.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing the road leading from Shin pond to Mattagamon postoffice, in Penobscot county.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing the highway over Marsh hill in the town of Stockton Springs, and providing for the future maintenance thereof.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in repairing the highway over Hardscrabble hill in the town of Orland, and providing for the future maintenance thereof.

Resolve in favor of the Children's Aid Society of Maine for maintenance.

Resolve in favor of the Healy Asylum

for maintenance, and also for a heating plant and the repair of buildings.

Resolve in favor of the town of Castine for the reimbursement of money spent in excess of a State road appropriation.

Resolve in favor of Mrs. Blanche M. Reynolds, Edward J. McWiggin, Thomas Hawkins and William H. Hawkins.

Resolve reimbursing the town of Orneville for expenses incurred in the commitment of an insane State pauper.

Resolve appropriating money to aid in rebuilding a bridge between the town of Southport and the town of Boothbay Harbor.

Resolve authorizing the State Treasurer and the State Auditor to adjust certain accounts in the State Treasurer's office.

#### Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Maxwell of Boothbay Harbor, unanimous consent was given and that gentleman presented out of order under a suspension of the rules, bill, An Act fixing the pay of night watchmen of the public buildings.

On further motion by Mr. Maxwell, the bill received its two several readings at this time without reference to a committee, and

On motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, the bill was tabled pending its third reading and specially assigned for consideration tomorrow.

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf of Portland, unanimous consent was granted, and that gentleman introduced under a suspension of rules out of order Resolve in favor of Pitt E. Averill, representative from Prentiss, granting leave of absence with full pay.

On motion by Mr. McCarty of Lewiston the resolve was tabled until tomorrow morning.

Mr. Sanborn of South Portland asked unanimous consent to introduce out of order a bill.

No objection appearing the bill was received.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make a word of explanation. The bill which I have just offered is an

act to incorporate a Title Guaranty Company in Cumberland county that was sent to me by mail yesterday by an attorney in Portland for whom I have the highest regard with the request that if possible it might be introduced during this session. The bill purports to incorporate a guaranty title company like two or three others which have already been incorporated, and this request coming from a personal friend leaves me no alternative but to ask the House for the privilege of introducing this bill at this time.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Sanborn, if he has examined the bill.

Mr. SANBORN: Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, that I have examined it but have not compared it with the other acts. I have taken the statements contained in the letter accompanying this bill which say that it is drawn in exactly the same form as the others which have been passed here.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that title guaranty companies can incorporate under the general law of the State, so far as the guaranteeing of titles is concerned. Some of them propose to loan money. Under the special acts that have been passed here these companies have not only the right to guarantee titles but to loan money. I don't know whether this one has or not, but I apprehend it has. Feeling that the city of Portland has got along until this time in the session without the services of this company, and inasmuch as they must get along until about the first of July anyway, it seems to me that I should personally object to the bill. It is special legislation, and the time for the receipt of special legislation has long since passed, and I see no reason for making any exception in this case; I trust the House will not accept this bill. I therefore move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

A viva voce vote being doubted, A division was had and the motion prevailed by a vote of 78 to 19.

Mr. GREENLEAF of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal

inquiry. I want to know if House Doc. No. 198, presented in this House February 16th and referred to the committee on sea and shore fisheries has been returned to the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state for the information of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Greenleaf, that in connection with the House Document No. 198 there appears to be a unanimous report of the committee on sea and shore fisheries, reporting "ought to pass" in new draft under the same title. This report does not appear to have been acted upon by this House. The bill was received and referred to the committee, and the report of the committee is tabled at this time, no action having been taken by the House.

Mr. GREENLEAF: Mr. Speaker, I will say for the information of the House that this matter seems to have been a little confused. House Bill No. 193 was introduced on February 16th and 500 copies were ordered printed. At the hearing it was suggested that some amendments and a new draft were to be attached to that bill, and as I understand it the committee reported unanimously. A stranger to the proceedings introduced a bill which he wanted the committee to consider. The committee thinking that perhaps it had some merit reported it to this House, and it was introduced in regular order; this is House Doc. No. 841, which was tabled by myself yesterday. Another bill was introduced by the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Mulligan, under a suspension of the rules, and which is properly before the House, and that bill is an exact duplicate of the one that was reported as a side issue to the main bill by the committee. So that there are two duplicates and one regular bill here. This bill, House Doc. No. 198, is the regular new draft; the one introduced by the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Mulligan, under a suspension of the rules is regularly before the House and House Doc. No. 841 is a duplicate and is not regularly here, and I understand it will be taken care of at the proper time; and I now move under a suspension of the rules that the report of the committee be accepted.

The rules were suspended and the report of the committee on sea and shore

fisheries, reporting "ought to pass" in new draft under same title on bill. An Act to provide for the destruction of dog fish and other members of the shark species in the waters of Maine, was accepted.

Mr. Greenleaf then moved that the rules be suspended and that this bill receive its several readings at this time.

The bill then received its two several readings, and on motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, was tabled pending its third reading and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

On motion by Mr. Mulligan of Nobleboro, unanimous consent was granted and that gentleman presented out of order the following order:

Ordered. That the Secretary of State be ordered to furnish sufficient covers for the filing of members' documents.

The order received a passage.

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I have tabled a bill incorporating the Grindstone Dam and Improvement Company, pending its third reading, and the bill has been specially assigned for next Tuesday for its third reading. I neglected to include in my motion that the bill should have been tabled for printing, pending its third reading. I therefore move that the bill be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House at this time Senate Doc. No. 310, bill, An Act authorizing the Clark Power Company to construct a dam across the Saco River between the towns of Buxton and Dayton. This bill has just been returned to the House by the engrossing clerk under the order which was passed in the House yesterday. This bill has passed to be engrossed in the House and passed to be engrossed in the Senate, and was in the hands of the engrossing clerk. It is now returned to the House under the order which was passed by the House yesterday.

Mr. GREENLEAF of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of friends opposing that bill, I move that the House do now reconsider its vote whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Sanborn of South Portland moved

that the matter be laid upon the table and be specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, pending the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Greenleaf, that the vote be reconsidered whereby this bill was to be engrossed.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Roberts of Portland, unanimous consent was granted and that gentleman presented under a suspension of the rules and out of order the following order:

Ordered, That Representative Howard H. Jordan of Baileyville, on account of illness, be excused from further attendance at this session, and that his pay and mileage be made up to the end of the session.

The order received a passage.

Mr. Small of Mt. Desert asked that unanimous consent be given and that he be allowed to present under a suspension of the rules and out of order Resolve in aid of repairing the toll bridge between the town of Trenton and the island of Mt. Desstr.

Mr. POLLARD of Solon: Mr. Speaker, I will say that the committee on ways and bridges have made their final report.

Mr. Small moved that the resolve be received and that it be given its two readings at the present time without reference to a committee.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, on general principles the objection to this resolve seems to be the same as to the other which we just refused to receive. It may be a very worthy proposition; I don't know anything about that, but the point is that it is too late in the session for us to consider this matter, and I trust that the House will not receive the resolve.

Mr. BESSE of Clinton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this resolve came before the committee and the committee voted that it "ought not to pass." Mt. Desert Island has a valuation of something over six million dollars and if they want to free the bridge let them free it; I am not in favor of receiving the resolve.

Mr. MORRISON of Eden: Mr. Speaker, this bridge is situated entirely in the town of Trenton, and that is a very poor town, and if this bridge should at any time be thrown upon that town they would be unable to repair it. The number of polls in that town is 101; the tax rate is 3 per cent.; the total valuation is less than \$140,000; there is no part of the bridge in any town on Mt. Desert Island, and it is situated entirely in the town of Trenton.

The question being on the motion that this resolve be now received under a suspension of the rules,

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion was lost.

On motion by Mr. Conners of Bangor, the rules were suspended and that gentleman presented out of order by unanimous consent the report of the committee on judiciary on bill, An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 71 of the Private and Special Laws of 1891, incorporating the city of Old Town, reporting same in new draft under same title and that it "ought to pass."

The report was accepted and the bill was tabled for printing under the joint rules.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to fix the salary of the agents of the Tribes of Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Indians, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, the pending question being the passage of the bill to be enacted.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of Mary J. B. Arkett, tabled by the gentleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair, the pending question being the second reading of the resolve.

On motion by Mr. St. Clair the resolve received its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

From the Senate: Ordered, The

House concurring, that there be printed 200 copies of House Bill, No. 495, as amended by Senate Amendments A and B.

The order received a passage in concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to provide for publicity respecting membership of mercantile partnerships, House Doc. No. 849, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the passage of the bill to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Plummer, the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to create a State Racing Commission, House Doc. No. 864, tabled by the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Dutton then yielded the floor to the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Colcord.

Mr. Colcord then moved that the bill receive its third reading and be passed to be engrossed.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed. I don't know whether the members of the House have read this bill or not. I have looked it through somewhat casually, and I find that it is simply a proposition so that somebody may have some running races if they want to. As I understand the situation, there is no law against running races now.

Section 4 of this bill provides as follows:

"Sect. 4. Every running race meeting at which racing shall be permitted for any stake, purse or reward, except as allowed by this act, is hereby declared to be a public nuisance, and every person acting or aiding therein shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and punished by a fine not less than five hundred dollars, nor more than one thousand dollars for each day of such meeting or racing; and in addition thereto, in a suit brought for the purpose by the State

racing commission in the circuit court of the county where it may be proposed to conduct such unauthorized racing, an injunction may be obtained against the same."

As I have before stated in 'his House in regard to some other matters, I do not see why it is any of the State's business whether a man wants to race horses or not; if anybody wants to race horses, let them race. That is the situation as it appears to me now. I trust that this bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Greeley of Portland moved that the bill be laid upon the table until Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would suggest that our time is getting short, and if possible all these matters should be disposed of at this time as they are reached.

Mr. Greeley then withdrew his motion to table the bill.

The question being on the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was agreed to and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to create a commission to act in conjunction with the State Armory Commission, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act relative to banks and banking, House Doc. No. 867, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act relating to closed season on fur-breeding animals, Senate Doc. No. 377, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plum-

mer, the pending question being the acceptance of Senate Amendment A in concurrence.

The bill received its two several readings.

On motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence, and the bill was then assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, Senate Document 388, bill, An Act relative to compensation to employees for personal injuries received in the course of the employment and to the prevention of such injuries, tabled by the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Descoteaux. The pending question is the third reading.

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: I yield the floor to the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment. In offering this amendment, I would state that under the provisions of the act as now drawn an employer employing five men is exempted. It seems to me that men working in small establishments should come under the provisions of the act. I therefore offer this amendment and move its adoption.

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House: I rise to oppose the adoption of any amendment to this bill. I want to say, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that at the beginning of this session a joint special committee on workmen's compensation was appointed. That committee, as you well know, was made up of seven members on the part of the House and three members on the part of the Senate. The committee listened to the various arguments for and against two bills which had been presented to the committee, to wit, the Cole Bill, so called, and the Swift Bill, so called. At the instance of the chairman of that joint special committee, who is one of the fairest men in this State and one of the fairest men of this Legislature, it was suggested that the attorneys for both bills get together and frame a bill that could be approved by the committee. The attorneys representing both sides

of the question were unable to come to any agreement. Therefore it was up to the committee to draft a bill, with the result that the committee submitted to you a bill which has the endorsement of eight men out of the ten who composed that committee; and I want to say in that connection that I presume it would have been nine out of ten had it not been for the illness of the gentleman from Baileyville, Mr. Jordan.

Now it is a recognized fact, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, that a workmen's compensation bill should be passed by this Legislature. Employers of labor have come to recognize the fact that an employee is something more than a piece of machinery, and that it is an economic question that their lives and limbs be conserved; and to this end there did not appear before this committee a person in objection to the idea of a workmen's compensation bill. Furthermore, the planks of the three parties—the platforms of the three parties contain planks providing for workmen's compensation.

Now it has been stated, gentlemen—and I want right here to read you an editorial from the so-called Biddeford Record in which it states that there are numerous defects in this bill, and that the three gentlemen active on that committee, Senator Cole and Representatives Sanborn and Higgins, are all known to be strong corporation men. I have no need to speak for my colleagues on that committee mentioned in this article. They are able to speak for themselves; but I want it distinctly understood—and men in this House who have known me for twenty-five or more years have never found me a corporation man, I regret to say. I would like to be a corporation man, and I believe every other man in this House would like to be; but unfortunately, or fortunately, I am not and never have been. Gentlemen, at the age of sixteen years, when I endeavored to get an education by lamp-light to contest with the world at large, I was a laboring man earning \$1.29 a day, and taking care of a family of four besides myself. We did not

have turkey every day, I can tell you, at \$1.29 a day; and I have come up through up to now, handicapped by early lack of advantages, I want to say to you, to hold my own with the world at large, though I am endeavoring to do the best I can. And when a man publishes an editorial like that in a paper I want to refute it, and I want to say that it is absolutely wrong. Is there a man in this House of any party who has found me playing unfair? Have my friends of the Democratic side of the House ever discovered anything that would indicate that I was playing unfair? Have I not always been in the open? Gentlemen of the Progressive party, have you found anything but fairness and squareness? No, and you never will! (Applause.) With all respect to the newspapers—they are of great power, and I grant it—I tell you that when a man puts an article in the paper that reflects on me and the other gentlemen, I want to take exception to it. Also in a morning paper a short time ago there was printed a statement from a distinguished gentleman, whose legal ability I do not question—I bow to it; but he is not going to tell me anything about this law.

Two years ago we introduced a bill here which was a miserable one. I voted for it right straight through, against my own convictions, because I believed it was a step in the right direction; therefore I supported it. At that time they were willing to exempt five; they said it was a cut from ten to five. Now let me go on record right here, gentlemen of this House, and say that I do not believe in any exemption, not one. I do not believe in exempting a soul under the compensation act; but, gentlemen, you know that you cannot get a bill through, just as well as I do, without exceptions. When they put the Swift bill in it was known that it could not pass without certain exceptions; and, gentlemen of this House, with reference to this bill the committee were of the opinion that it was necessary to make certain exceptions in order to give the great mass of laborers of this State a bill that was a fair bill—an honest bill to the employer and the employee. This

committee, composed of as square and fair men as there are in the House and Senate, gave you the result of their best thought and judgment.

Now I want to refute another statement, wherein it was said that this report was delayed on account of one member of the committee making strenuous objection. That is an absolute falsehood. Why this bill was delayed was on account of the illness of my friend who is now in the hospital.

Furthermore, that article says a strong lobby was employed to draft this bill or to introduce the draft of it. I want to refute that statement, gentlemen of this House, and say that the only men who ever approached me have not endeavored to lobby the bill. The strongest lobby, gentlemen, was on the other side of the question. No man has approached me only as any employer would with suggestions; and, gentlemen, members of your labor committee, and members of labor committees throughout this State, have come to me and said: "Mr. Higgins, we believe that to be a fair bill and we want to start under that bill."

Now we have presented to you a bill, gentlemen, that pays fifty per cent. of the wage not exceeding ten dollars a week, and a minimum of four dollars a week. We have made certain specified sums for certain specified injuries. We have given you a commission to handle it; and I want to say right here as to the compensation under this bill that the amounts in the event of death, total incapacity and partial incapacity are exactly the same as in the original Massachusetts act, and in the act that was presented to the Legislature and supported by the labor organizations two years ago in this House, and as in Rhode Island, and likewise corresponds to those in several other states.

By reason of the provisions for specific injuries, wherein it follows the Michigan method, the Maine act is more liberal than the original Massachusetts act, the Rhode Island or the New Hampshire acts.

As to the form of commission, it should be remembered that one of the special claims for these laws is that they are self-administering. It has been found that from 95 to 98 per cent. of all cases

adjust themselves automatically. The employer does not want any controversy with his employee. Under that bill all cases will be taken care of by him. It is for his interest to do it and he is going to do it. In Rhode Island during the first year only twelve cases involved dispute between employer and employee. I want to say in this connection, gentlemen, that I was in favor of having our courts administer the adjustment of these cases as under the Rhode Island law. Rhode Island employs more people than we do, and they only had twelve cases last year that came under the observation of that court; in fact, only four finally reached the court. I believe the State should be saved this expense. The court would be relieved from a vast amount of litigation in connection with cases which they have at the present time and would therefore have ample time to attend to these cases as they came before them.

But in the judgment of the committee it was felt that we ought to make concessions both ways, and so we gave the Swift bill the benefit of the administration feature. Now, I want to say that last year the state of Massachusetts reported 90,000 accidents to employees and expended \$125,000 a year upon her commission. Remember, gentlemen, that the conditions in Maine are entirely different from the conditions in Massachusetts. There was reported in Maine during the past year from the different industrial establishments approximately 1000 accidents. Maine has a less number of employees than Rhode Island. I want to give Maine the benefit of saying that perhaps they were not all recorded, and I want to be fair in that; perhaps there were a good many accidents that were not recorded. There is then no reason why Maine should establish any expensive commission in this regard to administer this act. The criticism comes from outside the State that the conditions under the Massachusetts law do not apply to the conditions in Maine, although this act was drafted to fit the conditions in Maine to the best of my knowledge and belief; and when one stops to consider the number of employees involved and the industrial conditions in this State it becomes apparent that there is no need for a commission composed of from three

to five men to administer this act. Certainly one man could dispose of twelve or fifty of these disputed cases. If the heads of other departments are called in to administer under the terms of this act there should be placed upon them no more of a burden than to secure the administration of this law.

Under the terms of this bill in case of death it provides for three hundred weeks, while the total limit under certain conditions is five hundred weeks. Under the original Massachusetts act it was provided in case of death three hundred weeks, total disability five hundred weeks, partial disability three hundred weeks; in the draft of the bill in Rhode Island it is provided that in case of death there should be three hundred weeks; total disability, five hundred weeks; partial disability, three hundred weeks.

I have here a letter from the Employees Insurance Association, and they have passed on this Maine Act, and this is what they say: "According to rough estimates which we have made, the proposed law in Maine would cost from 15 to 20% more than our Massachusetts law before the benefits were increased; and about 20% less than our present law with the increased benefits.

Now, gentlemen, I want to say that I believe this bill is a fair and honest bill. I am in favor of not making any exemptions, but I am not in favor of loading this bill up with amendments at this time. I say that this bill is a fair bill to start with; it does not place a burden upon the employer to such an extent that he can not bear it. Two years from now, if it is the will of the people, and conditions are favorable, I am perfectly willing for you to make such an amendment as will be right, fair and just. And, gentlemen of the House, let me tell you that this bill will reach from 90 to 95 per cent. of the employees under the hazardous occupations, so-called, in this State. I ask you, gentlemen, to sustain the Senate in the passage of this bill, which was passed in the Senate unanimously and comes down to us here; let us adopt this bill as it is, and if there is any fault in it we can remedy it later; it is a step in the right direction. And I want you to distinctly understand, gentlemen, that I am not opposed to labor; I am not in fa-



vor of corporations; I am trying to be fair, square and honest on this question as on every other act of mine during this session of the legislature. (Applause.)

Mr. PERKINS of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the Massachusetts Act exempts those employed on farms and domestic servants, etc. As regards the lumber industry that whole industry is exempted; but here five men who are employed in the same sort of business are exempted, whereas men employed in the same kind of business where it is a larger business are not exempted. It seems to me to exempt one, you should exempt all who are employed in the same business.

Mr. WESCOTT of Bluehill: Mr. Speaker, I did intend to go into this matter at length, but I do not think I will; I think it is pretty well understood that I have taken a great interest in labor legislation during this session of the legislature, and I want to do just what is right on the one side of the other in regard to this bill. I am opposed to any amendments either one way or the other. I believe the bill as presented is a fairly good bill, a step in the right direction, and I shall be satisfied that this legislature is performing a great public service if it passes this bill exactly as reported. (Applause.)

Mr. DESCOTEAUX of Biddeford: Mr. Speaker, I can not express myself as well as the gentleman from Brewer. (Mr. Higgins) and I won't detain you long. The gentleman from Brewer, (Mr. Higgins) said that two years ago they were willing to exempt five. Another feature that was taken out two years ago was that they must be regularly employed. A man who is getting \$16 a week would get \$8 and for 500 weeks that would be \$4,000. I proposed to the committee that the low man should be put down at \$4 a week, to give him \$2,000. It is the poor man who needs protection. I do not believe that there is another compensation bill in the union that exempts five men.

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one more word. Notwithstanding what my friend from Biddeford (Mr. Descoteaux) has stated, this bill was aimed to protect the man receiving small wages. He is the fellow who benefits under the bill.

Mr. CLIFFORD of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I was a member of this workmen's compensation committee. We all admit that this is not an ideal bill. When we were in session we took up the matter of drawing an ideal bill, and we could have presented to this legislature a bill which perhaps would in theory have been an ideal one; but the question which was before this committee was whether or not we could pass such a bill as that. It was the opinion of the committee—and we had long sessions and met often—that the bill which has been presented here for the consideration of this legislature was the best bill that could be drawn and presented at this time. There was an agreement among the members of the committee—and this was agreed by all except the gentleman from Biddeford, Mr. Descoteaux that we would take this bill because concessions had been made by both sides, that we would take this bill, and the gentlemen of the Republican side would do all they could in the Republican caucus to keep out any other amendments looking to the exemption of other employers, and the Democrats agreed to do the same thing. I signed that report, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to stand by my agreement with the other members of that committee, and I am going to vote against the amendment which has been proposed here this morning. (Applause.)

Mr. Sanborn of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I want just briefly to urge one consideration, and that is this: that if the door is opened to the reception of amendments, we have no way of knowing where it will end; or, to put it in another way, I think we all know that it will end in so many amendments being offered that there will be general confusion, and the result will be that the act will be killed entirely, a result which none of us want.

I quite agree with the criticisms which have been made of the bill. It is not all that could be desired, but as has been already so well said, the committee believed that it was all that could be passed at this session. I want to call your attention to one other fact, namely, that such an act as

this, changing so radically as it does the conditions under which labor is employed, when it goes into effect it must operate as something of a shock upon those who employ, and it is easily conceivable that a bill could be enacted which, while it might be exceedingly desirable ultimately, would operate as so great a shock as to be injurious. The committee believed that the employers could well adapt themselves to whatever changes in their methods are required by this act. They can accustom themselves to it for a couple of years and then it will be very proper, and I believe desirable, for further amendments to be made more liberal to the interests of labor; and I would only commend to your thoughtful consideration what I conceive to be the patriotic attitude of the gentleman from Bluehill (Mr. Wescott) a man known to be a laboring man, a friend of labor and identified with labor. I submit to you that the attitude of a man like that is entitled to the utmost respect and consideration on the part of this House. I submit that it is entitled to more respect and more weighty consideration than is the opinion of certain gentlemen who are radical, whose interest in their theory sometimes gets away with their judgment. They may be so zealous in the cause which they have espoused as to have been permitted to get into office somewhere, but at the same time I submit that the judgment of a thoughtful, impartial man is worth more. I do not know as it is necessary for me to say a word in defence of myself; I think that is beside the question. I know I was included in the editorial which has been quoted, and I will only say this: I do not take it nearly as seriously so far as I am concerned as my friend from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, seems to have taken it. I take it in the light which was expressed to me by a colleague of mine who said that he had noticed the editorial, and also said "Why we fellows who know you, and know what your attitude has always been in regard to corporations, thought it was a pretty good joke;" and I was willing to treat the entire editorial in just that light.

Mr. PERHAM of Woodstock: Mr.

Speaker, I do not want to enter into a discussion of this matter in detail. I simply want to make a statement of my position. I am pledged to support the workmen's compensation act. My party is pledged to the support of the workmen's compensation act, and I want to vote for a workmen's compensation act. From the condition of things this must be a compromise measure, and I am willing to accept the compromise that has been presented by this committee as the most fair that could be obtained under the circumstances. I am opposed to the amendment that has been offered, and I should feel obliged if that were adopted to disregard for personal reasons the fact that I am pledged to a workmen's compensation act and vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. CHAPLIN of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. BONNEY of Bowdoinham: Mr. Speaker, is that amendment in order now?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the amendment of the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Chaplin, can not be received at this time, the House now being engaged in the consideration of House Amendment A offered by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins. The Chair will give consideration to the amendment in due time.

Mr. BONNEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe we are already to vote on this workmen's compensation bill right now before my friend from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, gets the floor and moves that it be indefinitely postponed. This seems to be a sort of Plummer day. I believe we are already to vote on it, and I do not believe we need any yea and nay vote; neither do I believe that we need any division of the House. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Bonney, moves the previous question, which requires the consent of one-third the members. Those who desire the previous question will rise.

A sufficient number having arisen, the previous question was ordered.

The question being on the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins, that House Amendment A be adopted,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Chaplin of South Portland offered House Amendment B to Senate Doc. No. 388, to amend by adding to Section 4 the following:—"or in the harvesting of ice," and moved its adoption.

The question being on the adoption of House Amendment B,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost, and the amendment was rejected.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer the bill then received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill No. 837, An Act relative to scaling round timber and marking the contents on same, tabled by the gentleman from Bingham, Mr. Dutton, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Doc. No. 346, bill, An Act to provide aid for mothers with dependent children, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

A division being had, 84 voted in the affirmative and 26 in the negative, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a motion that this act be indefinitely postponed, and in view of the importance of the matter I wish to state in just a few words why I make this motion. It is familiar of course to the members of the House that we have already at this session passed a pension for the blind at a cost of \$40,000, that is, \$20,000 a year. Now I realize that it is very uncharitable to make a motion that this act be indefinitely postponed, but I do seriously feel that the time has not yet come when it is necessary for the State of Maine to establish any such wide-spread pension system as called for in this bill. You will notice if you will look at it that \$15,000 is appropriated for each of the next two years; that isn't the end of it. The bill fur-

ther goes on to say that any more money needed to carry out the provisions of the act shall be taken from money not otherwise appropriated. In other words, there is absolutely no limit to the amount which may come under this bill provided the people bring themselves within its terms. The State would be bound to approve and pay all of the claims that might come in, no matter what the gross total might be. That seems to me, to start with, a very poor method of financing, a very poor method of legislating. I will say further that the first mothers' pension act in this country was passed in 1911. It is yet in the experimental stage, and I can not believe that the condition of poverty in the State of Maine is so great that we are obliged to enter into any such wide-spread pension system as this until it has been demonstrated in the other states that it works well, and we can have some reasonable way of telling what the total expense called for under this act would be.

Another reason, coming to the real merits of the matter on which I wish to say a word. Under this bill the expense is to be one-half upon the town and one-half upon the State. The overseers of the poor in the different towns are supposed to make the estimates. At present of course the dependent mothers are not allowed to starve or their children to starve in any town where any decent reasonable sort of christianity or charity prevails. I believe that the towns should handle this matter. If you take it away from the towns and put it upon the State it is going to be easier all the time for people who in fact should not be entitled to a pension to secure one. A man will say there is no reason why he should provide for his family by insurance or anything of that sort. He would say to himself that he can go right along and spend all the money he wants to and when he dies there will be plenty of money to take care of his wife and children who will receive a pension from the State of Maine. I do not believe that it is advisable or reasonable that this

legislature should pass this act. I do not believe there is any necessity for it and I hope it will not be passed. I make the motion that it be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House. I am sorry that a matter which I consider of so great importance should of necessity come so late in the session for our consideration, and I am sorry that just at this time at the end of the forenoon session after you have been sitting here so long this morning when I know you are not in a mood to listen to further remarks,—I am sorry that a matter which I consider of so great importance to the State at large should have to be brought up just at this time. I do feel, however, that it is my duty as a member of the committee which heard this matter to state to you some of the reasons, as briefly as I may, why it seemed to the committee advisable to give this matter a favorable report. The very fact, I think, with a great many of us that this matter comes in to us labeled as a mothers' pension bill prejudices it a little in the public mind to begin with. I think the most of us rather look with suspicion upon the matter of pensions; I certainly do. We know that in many instances they are abused. I think it goes without saying that in some instances the United States Government has been abused and misused in the matter of pensions and undoubtedly any pension system must meet such abuse. But I do want to call your attention, gentlemen, to the fact that rather than being a pension bill this is a matter which means much more to the State and to the families deprived of their means of support and it ought in all fairness to have some other name.

The object of this bill as I understand it is to maintain in the State the family intact after the head of the family for some cause or another has been removed. I do not believe that there is any gentleman in this House this morning who disagrees with the proposition that it is desirable for the widowed mother to maintain in her own household her own children. She

is their natural guardian. She is the one person in the world left who has the greatest interest in their welfare, in their upbringing and in their proper teaching. Now, gentlemen, it seems to me that there can not be any question about that part, and if that is the object of the bill—and I take it to be such—then it seems to me that the only question for us to consider further is whether the bill as presented to us is a proper bill to accomplish such a benign purpose; and I wish every gentleman in this House had taken the time to study this matter thoroughly, but perhaps you have not. I do not find time to study all these matters that we must consider, and I apprehend it is the same with others. I do not know how I can present this more concisely and better than to go over with you briefly some of the principal features of this bill, and I will read parts of the bill beginning with Section one:

"In every city and town the Overseers of the Poor shall, subject to the provision hereinafter contained, render suitable and adequate aid to any mother residing in their city or town with a dependent child or children under the age of fifteen years," and right there I want to emphasize the fact that this aid ceases at the age of fifteen years. Now I think there cannot be any serious objection or question in the mind of any gentleman that up to that age the mother and the child are entitled to, and should have, some aid. The child up to that time is not able to take care of itself, of course. If it is forced to do so, it must, of course, neglect its education and be neglected in many ways. Continuing: "who is in need of, and desires." In the first instance there must be the need, there must also be the readiness on the part of the recipient to take "such aid to enable her to maintain herself and children in her home and who is a fit person to bring up her children." Now I submit to you gentlemen that I cannot see how language can be brought together which would more properly limit the aid which in some instances it would seem desirable to extend to this class of person. First, it is for the young

children, and then only if the mother desires to receive it; and further she must be a fit person to bring up her family or she has no consideration.

In Section two: "The amount of the aid which shall be rendered by the Overseers to such mother shall not exceed the value of five dollars a week, to a mother having but one child, under the age of 15, and further payment to the value of two dollars a week for each additional child, provided that the total amount of aid furnished to any one family shall not exceed twelve dollars." I think it is not necessary for me to comment upon that section. I do not believe that any gentleman would quarrel with the amount as therein fixed.

Now I want to show briefly some of the safeguards that are thrown around this matter under Section three:

"Any such mother needing and desiring such aid may apply therefor personally or by letter to the State Board of Charities and Corrections, hereinafter called the Board. The Board shall thereupon cause the applicant to fill out and sign an application blank, or shall fill out the same from information furnished by the applicant and cause it to be signed by the latter, in which shall be stated, first, the name of applicant, and that of her husband, the time and place of her marriage, and whether her husband is living or deceased; second, the names and ages of her children; third, her present residence and address, the length of time she has been a resident of this State, and where she has resided therein; fourth, the nature and amount of any property possessed by herself, her husband, if living, and her children, and the extent and sources of her income and theirs; fifth, the names and address of her near relatives and those of her husband, and of one or more persons to whom reference may be made for information; sixth, a statement that the applicant will agree to employ all aid received by her under this act solely for the support of herself and her children under the age of 15 years,

and their proper upbringing in her home."

I want to emphasize the last section wherein the mother is bound, if she receives this aid, at the peril of having it discontinued, to properly apply it for the purposes for which it was intended.

As to the manner in which the application and aid was given, it is provided in Section four as follows: "When such application has been made to the Board, it shall at once notify an agent for the protection of children within the county where the applicant resides, by furnishing such agent with a copy of said application blank so filled out, and the Overseers of the city or town where the applicant is residing," etc. That is, this investigation, as you will see by my reading, must be conducted in the first instance by two independent agents, the county agent, acting for the State Board of Charities, and the Overseers of the Poor of the town; "and said overseer and said agent shall thereupon each promptly make careful investigation by personally interviewing the mother in her home, looking up her references, and pursuing such other sources of information as are available, for the purpose of determining, first, the truth of the statements contained in her application; second, whether she is a fit person to bring up her children, and whether the inmates and surroundings of her household are such as to render it suitable for her children to reside at home; third, whether, under all the circumstances, considering her own resources and the ability of any member of her family to contribute to her support and the possibility of compelling contributions to be made for that purpose by any person under obligation so to do,—such mother is in need of aid under the provisions of this act, and if so, in what amount." Now, gentlemen, I submit to you, what language, and what better protection, could you throw about the dispensation of charity in worthy cases? There are these two separate investigating boards, and, if they disagree over the merits of a case, it must finally be referred, as is pro-

vided in a later section, to the State Board of Charities. I say what further, or what better protection could you have for the money which ought to go for charitable purposes? Have you ever known of a better system provided for attaining such an object?

Section five provides for making a report upon the investigation to the State Board of Charities, and their recommendation; and the State Board, if it finds upon the recommendations or upon investigation that a person, or a family, is entitled to the aid it orders it to be paid. I want to emphasize the last sentence of Section five, "and the city or town shall thereupon pay the same (referring to the aid) in money or its value to the applicant pursuant to said decision." Now we are told by those who are interested in and familiar with this kind of work that, in some instances, it is found more desirable to render aid to a family in some other form than money; sometimes supplies, sometimes clothing, sometimes bedding, sometimes taking care of the rent may be desirable, and it may be better that these matter be taken care of by persons interested in that work than by paying over the money directly to any member of the family. Now this bill further provides after these recommendations are made and payments begun for a system of oversight; and should there be a failure upon the part of the mother, with her children, to properly take care of the money which is given her, then this aid may be taken away upon the recommendation of those same agents who investigated the matter; or, if they are unable to agree after such an investigation is made, by the State Board. There is some criticism of this matter, I understand, and I think the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Pierce) touched upon that point,—that it may tend to extravagance. Now let us see if there are any safeguards thrown about that matter in the bill we are considering; and I call your attention to Section eight: "In any case, when application for aid hereunder is made by a mother who has a husband living, who is able by means of his property or labor to contribute to her support and

that of her children, but who wilfully neglects or refuses so to do, or who has deserted her and her children, it shall be the duty of the overseers or agent to whom such application is made to make complaint to the proper authorities within their county, and endeavor to compel such husband to contribute to the support of his said wife and children, under the provisions of Chapter forty-two of the Public Laws of 1907." There, it seems to me, is a safeguard. It is an attempt, at least, to meet the criticism advanced along that line.

Passing along to section ten, I read: "Any city or town rendering aid, under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the State for one-half of the amount given after approval by the Board and State Auditor of the bills of said city or town for aid so rendered." In the first instance, gentlemen, you understand upon the order of the State Board of Charities, the aid is paid by the town, and this provides for an equal division of the expense; so that the whole expense of this matter is not coming upon the State.

Now perhaps I have taken enough of your time in going over the provisions of the bill. I hope that the gentlemen of the House have had time to consider the matter. There is one other thing that I want to call your attention to, and I beg to differ with the gentleman from Houlton in his statement that the first law in this direction was passed in 1911. I am informed that the first law relating to this matter for the relief of destitute mothers was passed in 1909. Of course that is of no particular moment. In 1912 three states of this Union had adopted a law of this kind. And now, gentlemen, to show how this matter is considered in our sister states! Twenty-one states have a law of this kind. We have heard here for the past few days that we should not pay any particular attention to what other states are doing, unless their acts would apply equally well in Maine; and I quite agree with that proposition. It seems to me that it is immaterial what sister states do unless our need is plain for legislation; but I say to you,

gentlemen, that upon this particular question I think that that matter should have some consideration and is entitled to some weight for the reason that the needs of humanity are just the same in every state of the forty-eight that go to make up this Union. The widowed mother in California needs the aid just the same as the widowed mother in Maine, and I say to you that I think that is some argument in favor of this proposition.

I want to say to you further, gentlemen, in all fairness that I think this is an important matter. I believe that perhaps you may not have had all the opportunity you desire to study into it; I am sorry that we have not had more time to consider it. I think it is worthy of your serious consideration, and I want to implore you here this morning, because undoubtedly many of you may be here in succeeding legislatures—I want to implore you, I say, that you give this matter your earnest, careful consideration, if this matter fails of passage now, so that, if you may be returned here, you may have the matter in mind, and you may then be able to decide it upon its merits.

Now, gentlemen, I do not wish to abuse your patience by detaining you here longer. I cannot say anything in addition to what I have already said. It seems to me that this is a humane act. It is an act designed primarily to keep united the family, deprived of its means of support; and it seems to me that it is for the good of the state, for the good of the nation, to preserve the family intact. We have heard that ever since we were children—that the safety of the nation depends upon the integrity of the family; and I believe, gentlemen, that is one of the foundations upon which our government is placed. Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention. I invite your earnest consideration of this matter, and I trust that your decision may be for the best interests of the State and for the people we are considering this morning. (Applause.)

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker, I wish it perfectly understood by the members of the House that I differ in no single respect from the gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Thombs) in regard to the necessity of maintaining intact

the family. He and I differ simply in the respect of which is the proper agent to supervise, conduct and control the aid of dependents. There are certain institutions which, of necessity, the State must look after. No town is large enough to maintain an insane asylum; no town is large enough to maintain a great hospital by itself; no town is large enough to maintain a home for the feeble-minded of itself, or a State school for boys, or an industrial school for girls, or a reformatory for women. These institutions of necessity must fall upon the State, and must be maintained by the State; but I firmly believe that, despite everything that may be said in favor of this bill, that the control of these things should be in the local municipalities where the officers know the people, know whether or no the piteous tales of distress are true, whether or no the mother asking for money is deserving. I say that the local municipalities are the proper bodies to control these matters and not the State. Now the gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Thombs) says that this bill provides an adequate system for the control of this matter. Now, gentlemen, you can provide system, you can fill the Revised Statutes with systems; but the more system you have, the more it costs to do your work, and in many cases the less efficiently it is done. I can see no reason, and I have sufficient respect for the municipal officers of this State to believe that the needy mother who should receive aid from those municipalities, will and does receive it. I do not believe that in the small towns of this State, where the pauper aid is very small, that the town is too mean or too stingy to aid the people who are poor. Likewise, in the large manufacturing centers and large cities, I have faith to believe that those manufacturing centers and those large cities are able and willing to look after their own dependents, and not put the burden of that on the State. Now money expended by the State as a whole is not so carefully guarded, is not so efficiently done, as where it is done in the smaller places. The closer you get your control to the people who pay for it, to the people who know

about it, the more efficiently it is done. In my judgment—and I offer this in all sincerity—you have a greater likelihood, if these matters are conducted by local authorities, that the proper people will receive the aid than if the burden is on the State, with a lot of assistants traveling here, there and everywhere, who are oftentimes much more interested in their monthly pay checks than they are in the relief of the needy and dependent. I believe the local authorities are the proper people to look after this matter. In this connection, and while on this topic, I object to the word "pauper." I do not believe that word ever ought to be in the Maine statute book. I believe there should be a distinction between the people who seek aid because they are lazy, shiftless and drunkards and those who are really poor and needy without special fault of their own. The only real difference between this bill and a proper administration of our present law, except so far as the word "pauper" is concerned, is that this bill takes this matter away from the local control and puts it on to the State. It does not seem to me that such a shifting of the burden, of the responsibility, from the local authorities to the State, is a wise or a prudent thing. The principle of local self-government has been a cardinal rule in New England ever since the days the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock; and I see no need, gentlemen, of abrogating it in this respect at this time. (Applause.)

THE SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, that Senate Document No. 346 be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. THOMBS: I ask for a division of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A division of the House is called for. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, that Senate Document No. 346 will be indefinitely postponed, will rise and stand in their places until counted. The monitors will return the count.

A division being had, 84 voted in the affirmative and 26 in the negative, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House at this time House Document 403, An Act to fix the salaries of certain

public officers, which was acted upon here yesterday apparently in a hurry. There was a Senate amendment on this bill which was disregarded.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer the House reconsidered its vote whereby House Document 403, An Act to fix the salaries of certain public officers, was passed to be engrossed.

On further motion by Mr. Higgins, Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence.

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

Mr. GREENLEAF of Portland: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I would like to take up Senate Document 392, An Act relative to the taxation of mortgages on real estate in savings banks, tabled by myself yesterday. The pending question is the third reading, and I move that it have its third reading.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to that bill. If there is to be a session this afternoon I would be prepared at that time.

On motion by Mr. Plummer the bill was re-tabled until the afternoon session.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer, The House voted to take a recess until 2 P. M.

#### After Recess

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I move that we take up at this time Senate Doc. 311, bill, An Act to extend and enlarge the powers of the Limerick Water and Electric Company. By an error the original report of the committee on judiciary was never accepted, and the bill was recommitted to the committee by the House without concurrence on the part of the Senate. An Amendment was agreed upon, and I would now move that we reconsider the vote whereby this bill was recommitted to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

On further motion by Mr. Pierce the report of the committee was accepted.

The bill then received its first and second readings.

Mr. Pierce then offered House Amendment A to amend by adding



thereto the following: "and providing further that said consolidation of the Hiram Water, Light and Power Company shall not be authorized until said Hiram Water, Light and Power Company shall have established actual service in the town of Baldwin and in the villages of Hiram and East Hiram in said town of Baldwin."

The amendment was adopted.

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

At this point the Senate came in and a joint convention was formed.

### In Convention

(The President of the Senate in the Chair.)

The CHAIRMAN: The secretary of the convention will read the joint order under which this joint convention has been convened.

(The secretary then read the order under which the convention was formed.)

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Chairman, I move that His Excellency, the Governor, and the Executive Council be invited to be present at this joint convention.

The motion was agreed to.

The chairman thereupon appointed the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Higgins, as a committee to wait upon His Excellency, the Governor, and the Executive Council, and invite them to be present at the joint convention.

Subsequently Mr. Higgins reported that he had performed the duty with which he was charged.

Thereupon the Governor, attended by the Executive Council, came in and were given seats in the joint convention.

The CHAIRMAN: Members of the joint convention, we have been convened for the purpose of listening to an address by the Honorable Benjamin F. Cleaves, Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of Maine, who by his investigation and work on the Utilities Commission, and by his experience and observation in regard to the bill pending before this Legislature, and in regard to the reorganization of the Boston and

Maine Railroad system, is fitted to address us upon the subject and to give to us the information we desire for proper legislation.

Being in what we might almost call a committee of the whole Legislature, we hope each member will give him the attention he deserves, and from it we know we shall gather what we need for our committee.

I have the great pleasure and honor of presenting to you the Honorable Benj. F. Cleaves, who will now address you. Long and continued applause).

JUDGE CLEAVES: Your Excellency, the Governor, the Council, and gentlemen of this Legislature:

I wish that someone else had the task to perform which by your invitation, which is almost a direction, becomes mine at this time. I realize, as you do, the exceeding importance of first, the proposition of any legislation, whether it is necessary or otherwise; and next what form that legislation shall take.

I don't think that any member of this body may feel the slightest concern if, having read the bill originally introduced by the trustees, and later the document which the Utilities Commission presented to your committee for consideration, he finds himself in a position where he doesn't understand fully, or perhaps even to an indefinite extent, the meaning, the merit, and the scope of this bill. I don't care how brilliant a man may be, what may have been his professional or business experience, unless he has been intimately associated in the management and practical operation—including its financial details—with some large railroad corporation matters, the matters in this bill have been entirely beyond his experience, and hence he has nothing to apply from his experience and from his investigations to the situation that exists.

Two weeks ago, after this bill had been introduced, and after a long hearing had been had, upon the original measure, your Railroad Committee asked the Utilities Commission certain questions, and we sat down to prepare an answer to them as best we could. Before we had got very far upon that service, we found that the Legislatures of New Hampshire and Massachusetts had asked their commissions similar questions, and in Massachusetts the number had been

broadened out to something like thirty, and in one of the questions asked the Massachusetts Commission the intimation was quite strong that before answering them the Massachusetts Commission had better consult with the Commission of the other three states, Vermont also having a similar bill pending before its Legislature.

In response to an invitation from the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, the Chairman of the Utilities Commission went to Massachusetts, and there entered into a conference with the full Massachusetts Commission, and with the full New Hampshire Commission, and my regret was that the duties at the present time of the other members of the Maine Commission required their presence here in Augusta.

We spent five days of that week and a considerable portion of several of the nights in attempting to re-draft a bill. The conference lasted three days, and then a sub-committee, consisting of Mr. Eastman of the Massachusetts Commission, Mr. Benton of the New Hampshire Commission, and myself, were appointed to draft a bill in accordance with what was understood to have been the agreements entered into through the full conference. This bill has been printed, and is Senate Document No. 397, and was what had at that time been agreed upon by the three commissions, with the exception that certain members of the Massachusetts Commission reserved the right to place something in their bill with reference to the Hampden Railroad proposition, and I have no doubt when they introduced that into the report which the Massachusetts Commission made to the Legislative committee of Massachusetts that four out of five of the members recommended a section with reference to the Hampden Railroad proposition, but Mr. Eastman, the Commissioner who was appointed upon the sub-committee, and who acted with the other two, took an opposite view, and his position was that there was nothing in the Hampden Railroad proposition which it was necessary to place in any legislation, because the Hampden Railroad wasn't one of the subsidiary companies of the Boston & Maine Railroad system. It had never been recognized as such, and if either the old corporation

after it had perfected its re-organization, felt that the Hampden Railroad was necessary for its purposes and uses, there would be ample authority under the general laws of each of the three states to permit the old or the new corporation to take such action as would enable it to use the Hampden Railroad, either by lease or operating contract or purchase, or if the general laws were not sufficient in that regard, and special legislation were needed, it would be far better to have that in the form of a separate special act than to have the Hampden railroad situation injected into any of the bills in the three states.

That was the position of Mr. Eastman, and with that position Mr. Benton of New Hampshire and myself were in complete accord, and I am at this time in complete accord. I don't think, and I cannot recommend to you, that there is any necessity of any mention of the Hampden Railroad proposition in this particular bill. If you become convinced that the general law of the State of Maine is not sufficient to enable the old or the new corporation to do the things which may be necessary and to which I have referred, and special legislation is necessary I should think it better be in the form of a separate special act than to appear anywhere in this bill, which deals entirely with the re-organization of the Boston & Maine and its subsidiary companies.

When the sub-committee went to work, we took and—I have no doubt that in some instances more than twenty-five times—re-wrote every section of the twenty in the bill, which is printed and is before you. We realized that in the new bill some sort of enabling legislation was necessary in order to permit the Boston & Maine Railroad to re-habilitate itself. I am aware that there may be and are difference of opinion upon the matter, in the hearings which have been had here and in Massachusetts, and in New Hampshire; and no longer ago than yesterday Mr. Crooker—and some others agree with him—claimed that the Boston & Maine needed no enabling legislation, and the ground upon which I understand the claim to have been made is that the present prospects and the immediate future prospects of the Boston & Maine Railroad are such that, that in and of itself, will

enable the existing corporation to carry out its purposes without a receivership, or without any other untoward circumstances.

But I am not convinced that with \$18,000,000 in short time notes, which have been extended from March 2 to September 1 only, notes which the trustees in the utmost good faith say to us cannot be further extended, so that upon the first day of September this year there will come due that large amount of notes, if they cannot be extended, then I ask you to consider where the Boston & Maine Railroad is going to get the money or the other means to pay those notes?

We all know what the present credit of the Boston and Maine Railroad is. It must in some way, if these notes are to be paid when due and cannot be extended, raise that sum of money, and there is only one way that we know of in which they can do it, and that a large issue of bonds, which must necessarily, if sold at all, be sold at an exceedingly low price, putting an extraordinary burden upon the stockholders of the Boston & Maine Railroad, and deferring for many years to come their final payment, and postponing surely any return to the common stockholders during that period.

So I start with the proposition, which to me is perfectly clear, that there must be some kind of enabling legislation in order to keep the Boston & Maine Railroad out of a receivership.

Now as to whether that receivership is or is not desirable, I don't think I need to say anything to you. Your judgment relative to that would be fully as good as mine. If, however, a majority of you are convinced that a receivership is not good, either for the Boston & Maine or any other business institution, then we come immediately to the proposition of what kind of enabling legislation is reasonable and necessary.

The trustees have expressed a hope that the re-organization may be perfected under the old or present corporation and with that idea in mind they put into their bill three or four sections— which is seven in the bill before you—under which they provided or tried to provide, machinery for the reorganization of the old corporation. The bill is before you, and by the way the emergency clause which has been upon one of the documents

in our judgment now will necessarily have to be stricken out, and this measure cannot become a law, in whatever form passed, until ninety days after the adjournment of the legislature.

Section one of the bill was intended by the three commissions to provide a manner in which the Boston & Maine Railroad might be consolidated with its 23 or 24 subsidiary companies. I think that the language of that section is so absolutely clear that any explanation which I might attempt would be simply a reading of that perfectly clear language. In a word, it provides that the old company may buy or consolidate in the manner set forth in that section its subsidiary companies.

Down in lines 19, 20 and 21, comes an objection which the trustees, in a very full and frank conference which they had with us yesterday, and which was continued again this morning, made to us, and which Mr. Cook and Mr. Day touched upon in the hearing before the railroad committee yesterday. It relates to this particular language:

"At meetings particularly notified and called for the purpose by a vote of two-thirds in interest of the stockholders of each of the contracting corporations."

That of course necessarily means that not only should there be a two-thirds vote of the Boston & Maine stockholders—two-thirds in interest—but there must be two-thirds of each one of the subsidiary companies, representing a two-thirds vote of all the stock outstanding.

Now the trustees feel, and upon consideration we agree with them, that so far as the subsidiary companies are concerned, if at any meeting there is a two-thirds interest represented, and a vote taken which represents a majority of the outstanding stock of these subsidiary companies that ought to be sufficient; and you will see in a moment why the situation of the old Boston & Maine stockholders and that of the subsidiary lines is materially different.

The New Haven holdings in the Boston & Maine amount to between 51 and 52 per cent., so that in one

block, and in the hands of one interest, there exists more than a majority of the stock, and hence it would be manifestly unfair to the common stockholders to have simply a majority vote upon this proposition, because the trustees would at any moment have for voting purposes a majority of that stock; so the two-thirds in interest, so far as the Boston & Maine is concerned, should stand; but so far as the subsidiary lines are concerned, it doesn't seem fair to us, and I think that should be changed in accordance with the new draft which will be submitted to your railroad committee, and through that committee to you, so that the subsidiary companies, when they marshal at a meeting two-thirds of the stock in interest, if the vote represents a majority of the stock—that that should be sufficient to permit that subsidiary line to vote for the sale or consolidation. So that in the new draft there will be a change so far as the subsidiary lines are concerned in that respect.

That is the only change that will be made. You will notice, after glancing at the top of page three, that upon this consolidation any debts which either the Boston & Maine Railroad has against its subsidiary companies, or any claim which any subsidiary has against the Boston & Maine, are absolutely canceled and wiped out when the consolidation takes place, which leaves nothing hanging in that respect, and you will also notice that the whole of that scheme, except the matter of consolidation—which is properly left to the stockholders of the Boston & Maine and the subsidiary lines—all that follows after is subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission.

Now while I think of it, there seems to have been originally, when the trustees' bill was put in, some misapprehension as to the standing of the Maine Commission under the provisions of the bill which permitted joint conferences and joint hearings. The Maine Commission has an absolute veto, in every one of these matters, upon the other two commissions, so that if at any time a proposition

is made or anything is attempted which doesn't seem to the Maine Commission to be equitable, or in the interests, fairly and decently considered, of the State of Maine, the Commission can veto anything that is attempted to be done by the Commissions of the other two states.

Section 2 provides the means by which the Boston & Maine, the old company, may pay the stockholders of these subsidiary lines that come into the consolidation. I think the language of that section is so perfectly plain that there is no necessity of my calling your attention to any particular thing except that the securities which are to be issued, if any, and there necessarily will have to be securities to pay these subsidiary line stockholders, the amount and character of all such securities is under the supervision of the Public Utilities Commission.

Section 3 relates to the amount of the capital stock which can be issued by the Boston & Maine Railroad. Of course, there will have to be more stock, more securities, issued by the Boston & Maine Railroad, if they are going to buy the sixty million dollar proposition which is involved in the leased line securities of the companies, than the Boston & Maine already has outstanding.

But this section provides that in no event and under no circumstances shall the amount of securities so issued or authorized to be issued exceed the aggregate amount of the capital of the Boston & Maine Railroad outstanding and the aggregate capital of the leased or subsidiary lines outstanding, and it excludes from that amount any stock of any of the leased lines which the Boston & Maine Railroad now owns. If any gentleman of this legislature can think of any language which more definitely fixes the outside limit of the capital stock, or places any greater restriction upon the old corporation in the issue of securities in buying these leased lines, then surely the Public Utilities Commission will be very glad to have you put that language in for the purpose of that section. We spent a great deal of time upon it to limit and fix the outside capital stock of this corporation, after it had purchased the subsidiary lines, and so that it should not be greater than decent and permissible, not only under the law, but under all the

circumstances that surrounded the transaction.

Before I go to Section 4 I want to call your attention first to an additional section, either to be numbered four or to be in addition to section 3. I think you will agree that if there is to be a reorganization of the Boston & Maine Railroad by the old company, by virtue of which the leased lines, some of which they admittedly, and most of which undoubtedly have received as compensation a greater sum than the Boston & Maine Railroad could afford to pay, and in most instances a greater sum than was reasonable in view of all the circumstances; if these leased line stockholders are going to give up their contract or forego the provisions of their leases, they have got to have something offered to them to do it which shall be added to the fear of a receivership. I believe in stating the matter frankly, that the leased lines stockholders fear the receivership as much as the old stockholders of the Boston & Maine.

If the Boston & Maine common stockholders have to give up something in order for the leased lines stockholders to give up something, and thus form the consolidated corporation in which the stock holders of the leased lines will have an interest in the form of security of some sort, which may or may not bring in return, and to get them to forego a practically sure thing in the form of a lease or contract, the common stockholders in their yielding something, can only do so by in some form paying an assessment. I think everyone agrees that the common stock holders in the Boston & Maine Railroad, no matter how hard it may be, and no matter how hard they have already been treated and no matter how long it may postpone a rehabilitation of their stock in value, if it is to retain any value whatever, they have got to yield something in the form of some kind of an assessment.

There was presented by Mr. George W. Anderson, yesterday, who is the attorney who represented and is representing the Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission, and an attorney who worked with the sub-committee during the six or eight days we worked in all—and in many instances whose language is now in the documents which you are considering—he sent this additional section, and it will be before you later, and I will only take a

moment in explaining its purport. It was conceived as a means of some kind of assessment, by reason of the fact that not long ago the Massachusetts Supreme Court in a case before it determined that this particular form of assessment was valid. A business institution which had eight thousand common shares and one thousand preferred shares found itself in serious difficulties. The stockholders got together and voted to reduce the amount of common stock from eight thousand to one thousand shares, and then voted to increase the amount of the preferred stock from one thousand to three thousand shares. Thus leaving two thousand shares of preferred stock to be sold in order that the money might be brought in and the business saved.

The Court held that if the transaction was in good faith and necessarily in the interest of the company that the minority stock holders could not complain even although they went into Court on the equity side.

Section four has been suggested by Mr. Anderson for practically that situation. It provides that the stockholders may vote to reduce the amount of their capital stock. In considering this section bear in mind that these stockholders that are doing it, and that the number of votes necessary, does not place it in the hands of the trustees who hold more than a majority of the stock. That has been safeguarded. They vote to reduce their capital stock, say 50 per cent.; they issue preferred stock to the amount of that reduction, and they issue an amount of secondary, common stock, also equal to that reduction, with the provision that the common stockholders of the Boston & Maine Railroad, as well as the preferred stockholders may subscribe for the new preferred stock, and the payment will be in cash and that would furnish a considerable quantity of new money to assist in paying the debts, and each subscriber will have his proportionate amount of secondary common stock. So that each person who wishes to buy this preferred stock, which will have not exceeding a 6 per cent dividend, may also receive a sufficient amount of the common stock, so that his holding, so far

as number is concerned, is the same, although the dividend if any, which he gets on the secondary stock must be postponed to a time when it is hoped the Boston & Maine Railroad will again be a successful business corporation, and when the secondary common stock will then be receiving a portion at least of the earnings.

That is a form of assessment of common stockholders. It does not necessitate the payment by them of any money. Their rights to subscribe for preferred stock will be assignable, and and if of any value they may be sold and thus get a bonus of the secondary common stock. But in no event can the directors compel any common stockholder to pay any money in the form of an assessment. That seems to be, if an assessment is necessary, that seems to be the most decent way of making that assessment.

Section four as at present written provides for modifications or renewals of the existing lease and operating contracts. Of course that would absolutely be necessary, because it may be that some of the leased line stockholders would not agree—some of the leased lines might not care to absolutely give up their leases and abrogate their contracts and take stock of the Boston & Maine. They might prefer to make a new trade, although they got a lesser amount. And you can see how essential it must be if the Boston & Maine is really to continue and be prosperous as a system, it must have virtually all the constituent elements. And if a subsidiary line is to be found that did not see fit to give up its lease or operating contract and take stock, then the alternative would be to permit the Boston & Maine Railroad to make a new operating contract or a new lease, but in no case should they call for a higher rental or greater return than the subsidiary company now receives.

Section five was written simply for this purpose. We didn't know what might be done in Vermont. The Vermont Public Service Commission didn't meet with us in conference, and we didn't know whether there would be any legislation in Vermont or not.

Some of the subsidiary companies were organized under the laws of the state of Vermont; some of them were organized under the laws of New York; and one, I understand, under the laws of the Dominion of Canada; and it was necessary, to enable the Boston & Maine to make similar sorts of trades with these corporations so organized, and you will see that in each instance each one of those contracts is made absolutely under the control of the Public Utilities Commission.

Now section six will appear before you in the form of a new draft for your consideration, and I think it is an important section, and ought to receive some consideration. As the section now stands, it provides for the funding of the floating debt of the Boston & Maine Railroad, which, as I am told, and it was stated here yesterday, is at the present time something like \$18,000,000. Necessarily that debt, which is largely and almost entirely in the form of notes maturing in the early part of September, must be taken care of, and it was thought, and I still think, that it would be necessary to refund that by the issue of either stocks or bonds, or perhaps both. The Boston & Maine Railroad has also a deficit, which on the 30th day of June last, when they made their annual report, amounted to three million, three hundred and fifty-one thousand and some odd dollars. Mr. Day very frankly stated yesterday, in the hearing before the railroad committee, that that deficit, by the time this act should take effect, would probably be one million dollars more than that.

So that it is safe to say that the deficit of the Boston & Maine Railroad, on the thirteenth day of June next, will be from four and a quarter to four and a half millions. On the books of the Boston & Maine they carry a premium account of six and a half millions, by reason of the railroad selling its stock under the peculiar laws of Massachusetts, which require it to be sold at a certain figure, rather than at the market price; and there goes into the treasury the accumulation of money so received over and above what the market

value of the stock was at the time it was sold.

Now the proposition is that instead of amortizing—or in plain language, killing—this deficit, to fund it by giving bonds. Perhaps I had better explain that just a little bit as it now stands.

The section as it now stands provides that this deficit may be funded, and I don't need to say to you that that isn't a good business proposition, and that if it weren't for this extraordinary situation in New England these days there are lots of things that wouldn't appear in any bill submitted to any legislature. And it isn't good judgment to fund a deficit. This act provides for the funding of that deficit, and provides also that that deficit shall be gradually amortized, or put out of existence, so that it won't continue to exist as a debt which shall be at all times owing; and it is estimated that that of itself might postpone a dividend on the common stock for two years.

Now the section which will be submitted provides that that deficit—or so much as shall exist on June 30 of this year—shall be charged off on the books against the premium account, which now is six and a half millions and a little more, so that as a matter of book-keeping—and the matter is entirely one of book-keeping; I had pretty hard work to believe it, but Mr. Skelton is authority for it, and I find he is backed up by a great many other people—as a matter of book-keeping the deficit is entirely an asset; and the suggestion is that instead of capitalizing that deficit in the form of stocks or bonds that that deficit shall be charged off against so much of the premium account—four and a half millions of deficit against four and a half millions of the premium account, and no stocks or bonds whatever issued against that; so that when it comes to refund the debts of the Boston & Maine Railroad, instead of it being eighteen million to refund it will be something like fourteen million upon which interest must be paid, and the postponing of the return to the common stockholders thus longer delayed.

Section seven simply provides that if the old Boston & Maine Railroad does bring about its re-organization by itself within the period of a year, the preceding sections are of no effect, unless

the railroad shall have progressed so far that in the judgment of the Public Utilities Commission it would be wise to permit them to continue for a year longer.

Now all of the other sections relate to a new corporation, and section eight simply provides a method by which that new corporation may first come into existence. Section nine states what the certificate to be filed in the office of the Secretary of State shall set forth. Section ten provides still further machinery for the coming into existence of the new corporation.

Now we come to section eleven, and I suppose that sections eleven, twelve and thirteen will be the most important matters that you have to consider.

I passed rather an uncomfortable forenoon, because the trustees, who are men of ability and integrity, versed, some of them, in railroad affairs, all of them having broad and accurate knowledge with reference to financial affairs in the matter of the financing of propositions of this sort, violently disagreed with the commissions of three states, and when men of that sort come to you and tell you wherein they think that in attempting to formulate legislation which shall be of benefit to this crippled corporation you are actually putting trigs in the way of its becoming of any benefit whatever, I am in a frame of mind where I am willing to stop and think it over; and upon sections 11, 12, and 13, I don't think I ought to be asked to give you any opinion.

I do feel, however, that I should state to you the reasons why the trustees think there should be very material and very important changes made in these matters, and also give to you the reasons which appeal to the commissions of these three states why those should be in there, and I don't think I can better tell you what the position of the trustees is than by reading to you from a document prepared by them and submitted to the Massachusetts legislative committee yesterday afternoon in the hearing which was going on there.

With reference to Sections 11, 12, and 13, permit me to say before I read this that these sections provide that before any securities can be issued by the new corporation, and before any contract with any

subsidiary or with the Boston & Maine Railroad, which will then be an old corporation, and not to be re-organized under the first sections of the bill—before any of those things can be done, the trustees, or those new directors which will come into existence under sections eight, nine and ten, must submit to the Public Utilities Commissions in the three states as complete a plan for their re-organization as possible.

Our idea was that they should go to each of the subsidiary lines and find out what they could do with them. They should meet with the directors and have a corporate meeting of the Boston & Maine stockholders. They should make tentative or contingent contracts with these subsidiary lines, but nothing that should be absolutely final and binding until that plan, practically completed, had been formulated by the directors and submitted to the Public Utilities Commissions sitting jointly in the three states; to make sure that the draft were consistent with the public interests, and in all respects conformable to the law of the three states; believing, as was stated by one of the Commissioners, that, no matter how eminent, no matter how honorable, no matter how able any men or set of men might be, that it was the duty of your commissioners to see that not even in the hands of these good men should be placed the authority and power to bring about and accomplish any of the things which have resulted during the mismanagement of the Boston & Maine Railroad during the last few years; that it was better to safeguard every one of these propositions well than to trust even so eminent men as these five trustees with unlimited power.

Now that was the position of the three Commissions. It was not dissented from by any member of the three Commissions, and it received at the time it was put into this bill the somewhat reluctant assent of Mr. Anderson, who said that the trustees felt they were handicapped too much, and couldn't get out under that sort of a scheme and perfect a re-organization. Now I understand these to be the reasons they say they cannot work under the bill as it stands:

"If a new corporation is formed nothing can be done to bind anybody until after an elaborate plan has been formed,

'complete' so far as practicable in every detail effecting any of the numerous corporations, and as to all pecuniary matters, and all rights and proceedings affecting stockholders in the Boston & Maine Railroad and stockholders of the new corporation, as well as stockholders of all the subsidiary corporations. A public hearing must be given upon this plan, and it must be approved in its details before anything can be done with any legal effect in any matter included in it. After action by the Public Service Commission protracted appeals are open to parties under the statutes and would be likely to be taken. Such a plan that would have any value could never be formed, until it was ascertained what the various parties interested would do. Nobody could make a binding agreement to do anything. To be able to form an opinion approximately that would include all parties would be likely to be an impossibility. To do anything of account in that direction would probably take many months.

"In the absence of any right to make binding contracts as to matters involved in the plan, financial arrangement for a distant future would be well nigh impossible, and in this and other particulars the proposed scheme would seem likely to prove utterly impracticable.

"In our judgment, it is more than probable that no reorganization of the Boston & Maine system can ever be effected under the obstructive provisions of this bill as it is now presented.

"The trustees are of opinion that the bill should be amended by permitting a majority of the stockholders in the several corporations to rule in determining what contracts should be made, instead of leaving one-third in control. They are of opinion that the corporations should be permitted to contract with one another in such matters as the determination of prices and the nature of their mutual relations and the distribution of joint earnings, without being made subject to the control of a public service commission as to the terms of their contract—much more without being obliged to obtain the approval of their contracts by three public service commissions. The trustees also believe that these several corporations should be permitted without obtaining previous approval of a definite plan, to



go on and make binding contracts with one another for the operation of their respective railroads as parts of one system, subject to no other conditions than a requirement that they satisfy the public service commission that their several contracts and their reorganization are within the authority of the act, which should allow such proper contracts by mutual arrangement with a view to the perpetuation of the system."

I understand that one of the principal things which they say they cannot do, the trustees, under this bill as it exists, is to finance the organization scheme. I argued with Mr. Cook and Mr. Day yesterday morning along these lines; I asked them if these provisions in Sections 11, 12, 13 were not in the bill and they had a perfectly free hand to go out and make their contracts with the subsidiary lines, if first they would close them definitely and finally in contracting with anyone of these companies until they could find what they could do with all the rest, and if they could tell how much they had got to raise to finance the new corporation until they had found out how much they had got to pay the subsidiary lines. You can readily see why that was argued. Because, if it be true that no under-writing concern could tell how much they had got to raise until they knew how much they had got to pay, then it may be you will conclude that these safeguards whereby they must bring in a practically complete plan, do not in relation to the finances put any greater burden on the trustees, than the unhampered opportunity to go out and make the same kind of contracts with the same kind of people. They also say, as I understand them, that there would be extensive appeals. I apprehend that any bright attorney could find any number of ways of holding up a reorganization by the new corporation with the old and with the subsidiary lines, if the plan or the contract, or the treatment which the new company was giving to the old and the subsidiary lines, was of such a character as to cause protest by any substantial minority that might be affected.

So that I cannot see why the right

of appeal that may be given in Sections 12 and 13 would cause any greater delay or more onerous burdens than would the rights of the minority stockholders to protest and interfere if the trustees had a free hand.

The trustees say that it would necessitate very many lengthy hearings. I can say only in answer to that, that it is my personal belief that if your Public Service Commission has to stay for six months and listen to more or less nonsense during that time, and in the end bring about a decent, fair and reasonable reorganization of the Boston & Maine Railroad system, it is far better that the reorganization should be postponed for six months and your commission meet during that time than that the reorganization should be so hastily attempted that the future usefulness and prosperity of the Boston & Maine should be limited as a result of haste or something worse. I simply state that for your consideration.

Passing over Sections 11, 12 and 13, which I think I have practically covered, and given you a fairly as I can what I understand to be the objections of the trustees to the provisions of those sections, I go to Section 14 which merely provides the extent of the life of the new company in case it does not bring about re-organization. It provides that if the new corporation is not able to bring about a re-organization within two years then its life as a corporation ceases.

Section 15 provides what may be done, if, in spite of everything, the Boston & Maine goes into the hands of a receiver. Of course you understand even though a re-organization is attempted; even though it may be nearly perfected, even though the new corporation has gone, however far, in carrying out its plans, a receivership may be had. Section 15 provides that if there is a receiver and a receivership that the new corporation may purchase the franchises and property, and whatever the receiver has to sell, and to that property so purchased attaches the powers, responsibilities and duties of the new corporation as defined in this act.

Section 16 provides for the minority stockholder, and that of course is absolutely essential. Section 16 is practically a statement of five or six sections of Chapter Forty-seven of our Revised Statutes, except that it gives the minority stockholder three months in which to perfect his dissent, instead of only one, as our statute now provides.

That gives to any minority stockholder of the Boston & Maine Railroad, or any of its subsidiary companies, who votes in the negative upon any scheme of consolidation or any scheme of taking away his property and transfer it to someone else, an opportunity to start proceedings so that his stock shall be valued by a court, and that value so found shall be paid to him in money.

While on the question of the minority stockholder. I want to go back for just a moment to Sections 11, 12 and 13 of the plan or scheme, and the answer of the trustees, and give you this thought to take away with you. Unless the directors of the new corporation can go out to the subsidiary lines and make so fair a proposition and so decent a trade that there will be only a very small minority dissatisfied, and come in and have their stock valued, is it to be expected that the re-organization would go through? Because in this section which I have just discussed it gives to the minority stockholders the right to have their stock valued. If there should be, for instance, approximately one-third of these minority stockholders refuse to come in, that means that, the subsidiary lines having a capitalization of sixty millions, that would represent a value of approximately twenty millions that would have to be valued, and whatever it was valued at would have to be paid in money—probably not that sum—and the Boston & Maine stockholders—the capitalization is forty-two and a half millions, and one-third of that would be fourteen millions, with perhaps a value of one-third or less put upon that, which would necessitate, in my judgment, the raising of so much money to be paid to minority stockholders that it would be practically prohibitive, and that thing of itself would prevent the re-organization.

Section seventeen simply provides that in all matters under the bill there shall

be joint hearings—joint taking of testimony and joint conferences—between the three states.

Section eighteen—I don't know but very little about that. That was written in Massachusetts and submitted to the Massachusetts Bank Examiner, has passed under the scrutiny of Mr. Skelton of our Commission, who was a former Bank Examiner, and I understand from him was submitted to the present Bank Examiner who makes no suggestion of change, and as you will see simply, in my judgment, gives to Boston & Maine stock or any savings bank a certain standing until January 1, 1918, and in the meantime the Legislature will have met, and if the situation and circumstances of the Boston & Maine as re-organized shall be such that the Legislature at that time thinks that it may be straightened out a little more, and these securities still be legal investments for savings banks, that may be done.

This stock cannot be a valid investment for savings banks in the State of Maine, except that already there, until for at least one year and thereafter until the investment in the Boston & Maine shall have paid a certain dividend.

Section nineteen simply provides the penalties for knowing violation of law.

Section 20 relates to the payment of expenses. Of course you understand if a new corporation was to be formed in the State of Maine and its capital stock was, as this will be, some one hundred and ten million dollars, under the provisions of Section 5 of Chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes there would be an incorporation tax coming to the State of Maine of between eighty-two and eighty-three thousand dollars. That seems to me manifestly unfair, to take that amount of money out of the common stockholders, because there is to be really no actual new corporation come into existence, but simply a new name for an old one. It also seems to us unfair, if in the reorganization of the Boston & Maine the public service commission of this state would necessarily have to go to Massachusetts and elsewhere and hold hearings, which would necessitate an expenditure, and it is our attitude to ask no greater appropriation than the amount we have actually and necessarily used. We ought

not to be called upon to pay out of that appropriation the cost of those hearings, nor ought the state out of its treasury to be obliged to pay it. And so in place of the word "franchise" in line 2, and upon the suggestion that there was some misapprehension upon the part of some members of the legislature, that that was intended to protect them, the Boston & Maine, either the old or new corporation, from paying any taxes in the State of Maine, which of course was not the case. If you glance at Section 5 of Chapter 47 you will see where that is limited solely and only to the incorporation tax, or fees that the new corporation must pay. We have substituted the words "incorporation tax," so that there need not be any further misapprehension with reference to the matter.

I think I ought to ask your pardon for going into detail so much in this matter, but I assumed you wanted to know pretty near all I could tell you in regard to this proposed legislation.

Having gone quite fully into this matter I should be very glad, and I speak for my associates on the commission, at any time after this convention is dissolved, to sit down with any man or group of men and go fully into this matter. Because there is nothing that is going to come before this Legislature or any other that will be of so great consequence to you and me and to other people in New England.

If we make a mistake, if the trustees are right and we are wrong and we pass a bill that they cannot work under, then of course the blame will be upon us, and perhaps will fall primarily upon the Public Utilities Commission.

That is why I realize the responsibility which rests upon the members of the Legislature, because I apprehend that they rely, or will be guided to some considerable extent by what we say; and so I say to you, gentlemen, that if any of you have got any suggestions to make with reference to Sections 11, 12 and 13, the Public Utilities Commission, and the committee on railroads and expresses, need your help, because it is a workable bill, a bill under which no serious mistake can be made, and the Boston & Maine Railroad and the people of New Eng-

land are entitled to nothing more, and surely to nothing less.

Senator BOYNTON of Lincoln presented the following resolution and moved its passage:

"Resolved, That the thanks of this Joint Convention be hereby extended to the Honorable Benjamin F. Cleaves for the able and instructive address with which the Convention has been favored."

The question being on the adoption of the resolution, a rising vote was taken, and the resolution was unanimously adopted.

The PRESIDENT: The Secretary will place it upon the records of the Convention.

The business for which this Convention has been convened having been consummated, the Convention is now dissolved. The Senate will retire to their chamber. The members of the House will remain in session in the House of Representatives.

The governor and Council then retired.

The purpose for which the convention was formed having been accomplished, the Senate retired to the Senate chamber.

### In The House

(The Speaker in the Chair.)

The SPEAKER: The House will now recur to the matters on the calendar at the point where we left them before taking recess this forenoon. The Chair lays before the House Senate Doc. No. 401, bill, An Act to complete the records in the registry of deeds in Androscoggin county, tabled by the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, the pending question being the second reading of the bill.

Mr. Higgins of Brewer moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed, that gentleman stating that he made this motion at the request of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of improving the roads through the property of the School for Feeble Minded in the town of Pownal, North Yarmouth, Gray and New Gloucester, House Doc. No. 679, ta-

bled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the second reading of the resolve.

Mr. Plummer then yielded the floor to the gentleman from New Gloucester, Mr. Blake.

Mr. Blake then offered House Amendment A, to amend by striking out in line three the words "and one thousand dollars for the year 1916."

The amendment was adopted, and on further motion by Mr. Blake the resolve received its second reading and was passed to be engrossed, as amended.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House House Document No. 675, Resolve providing for permanent outside service extension to present and proposed new buildings at the Maine School for Feeble Minded, tabled by the gentleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair. The pending question is the second reading of the resolve.

Mr. ST. CLAIR: Mr. Speaker, when I tabled that resolve it was done to have it considered at the same time with the preceding resolve. All these resolves here, five of them, refer to the School for the Feeble-Minded. Now these resolves involve an appropriation of quite a large sum of money. Personally, I am in favor of the passing of all of these resolves. I do not know how the House feels about them. I do believe this: that if the members of the House had personally had the opportunity to visit the institution, as I did, go over it, get some idea of the work it is doing, and of the difficulties under which it labors on account of the incomplete condition of the institution, they too would feel that this institution which is a State institution, should be fostered, increased, to carry out the work for which it is intended. I have been informed that there are in the State of Maine somewhere from 1200 to 1500 persons who would come under the provisions admitting them to this institution. The institution at present is able to care for about 250. I am told that the State at the present time is caring for almost twice as many outside, paying the expense of their care on something like 400 or 500, an expense fully as great, or greater, than the State would have to pay if

they were in the institution, with the added fact, Mr. Speaker, that they are not as well cared for, not receiving the treatment that they should receive; not receiving the advantages of an institution of this kind. Now Mr. Speaker, one of the great objects of this institution, one of the principal arguments used for the institution, of the founding of the institution, was to segregate these feeble-minded of both sexes so that they could not unite and produce more feeble-minded. Not being in the institution, scattered through the State, and exposed to the lust of men, the State loses that great advantage of having an institution of proper size. When I visited the institution during the session of this present Legislature, I found quite a large number of the inmates kept in a room which was used for bathing and toilet purposes. They did not have any other place in the daytime to keep them. Now, of course, that was only done because of the crowded condition of the institution. I am met with the objection from some of the members who have talked this matter over with me—and I pay them the compliment of saying that they agree with me in the fact that the institution should be enlarged when the State has enough money; but I wish to remind this House that a few days ago when the question of renovating a wing of the hospital across the river was before it,—mind you, these people down here in Pownal have not even a wing fit to be renovated—when the question of renovating a wing in that hospital over the river came up, this House quickly appropriated \$85,000 for that purpose. Now it does not seem to me fair that the institution at Pownal, it does not seem to me fair that those helpless beings in our midst, it does not seem to me fair that the people of the State of Maine, that this House, should refuse to consider the needs of this institution and consider them carefully, considerately and generously. Now I do not find—and I went over this carefully while I was down there in the presence of some other members of this House—I do not find that the superintendent asked for anything more than is needed there to carry out the plans of the

institution. This is not a question of building luxurious quarters; it is not a question of buying rugs for \$105 or of expending \$85 or \$100 for laces for any room. This is a question of providing quarters for wards of the State of Maine. Now it may be said: Why you people up in the House there talk as though the money you are spending was your money. I like to have a legislator feel that way, to take that view, and to feel that when he votes to appropriate money he is voting some of his own money. I do not consider that parsimonious; I do not consider it wrong. I am glad when legislators feel that way, because there is a sense, Mr. Speaker, in which this House is the State of Maine. A great many things which are done in the State of Maine have to be done in this Legislature, and we in that sense are the State of Maine, and this money we appropriate is our money. But there is another side to this: These children at Pownal, and the others who should be there, are the children of the State of Maine, are the children in a sense of this House, and they should be cared for and cared for with generosity. I wish that you could have gone down there and seen some of the beings that are in that institution. I saw there a boy tied up who looked to me to be 17 or 18 years old, who never had spoken a word in his life, who could not speak a word, and could not be taught to speak a word, as helpless as an infant, and who had to receive the same care and attention that a child in arms has to receive;—not only one, there were several of them, nearly a dozen, just as helpless. And there are others through the State of Maine. It is unfortunate; they are unfortunate. We may say the State is unfortunate; but they need to be cared for, and this institution, Mr. Speaker, should be enlarged to carry out the object for which it is intended. I do hope that the gentlemen of this House will consider with some degree of generosity the needs of this institution at Pownal.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, I was not so limited in ability to present the needs of the institution. I wish I could have spent a fortnight there instead of two days, and acquainted myself

thoroughly, so I could give you the full benefit of all the information which this House ought to have in order to act intelligently in this matter. I feel deeply in this matter because I went there and saw what this institution is trying to do and what it is doing. Now these individuals are not all as unfortunate as those I have mentioned. I found that there were certain of the children who were amenable to teaching. Some of them were learning trades. I saw a little girl running a knitting machine, a darning machine, and she was doing nice work, doing work for the school. I saw two boys mending shoes. They were learning a trade, and the superintendent of that institution told me that they had a boy who came there apparently of so feeble a mind that he could not learn scarcely anything. He stayed there two or three years, and now that boy is earning almost two dollars a day. They found a way to reach his mind. The people with whom he had been living never would have found it. He is now self-supporting; and there are others there going the same road and becoming self-supporting in the community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an institution that needs to be cared for, and there is one side of it that you should think of. These are not insane people at Pownal. Some of them are capable of taking a certain amount of instruction so that they can go out and do work and care for themselves; and it does seem to me that an institution doing work of this kind needs to be looked after, and needs to have room enough to do it in. They need to have rooms enough so they will not have to use their toilet and bath rooms to keep the inmates in. They need the buildings they ask for; they need all they ask for; and it is going to cost a good deal of money. I do not know as you can appropriate all this at this time; but this Legislature at this session should make such an appropriation so that two years from now the institution can be put upon a basis somewhat approaching what the founders of it intended.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, the situation is outlined as the

gentleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair, has stated. I have no doubt that many things ought to be done over there, as well as at all other institutions of the State; but it seems to many of the members that the plan upon which things are being done there, and upon which they have been done, are not such as to commend to us that we should at the present time expend any greater amount of money than is absolutely necessary under the circumstances. There are, as the gentleman has stated, three or four resolves here before the House this afternoon. This present one is a resolve providing for outside service extension to present and proposed new buildings, and, as I recollect it, relates to connecting with steam pipes, and perhaps sewer pipes and electric light wires, and the like of that, in the present and proposed new buildings.

Mr. ST. CLAIR: And the carrying of water through the buildings.

Mr. PLUMMER: If the buildings are not built, to that extent, anyway, this outside service extension would not be needed; and it seems unlikely that all can be built in the present financial condition of the State. To digress for a moment, the situation financially is this: The fixed charges of the State, and the bills and resolves carrying money that have already been passed by the Legislature, and the resolves that have been reported favorably by committees, all total some \$842,000 in excess of a ten-mill tax rate; that is, five mills each year for the years 1915 and '16. Now the situation is that the knife must be put in somewhere. The only question is as to whether at this School for the Feeble Minded, as I said before, the plans, perhaps, seem to some of us not to have been properly laid out or carried out, and it is a question with us whether they were made with such reasonable regard to efficiency and economy as to entitle us to go ahead on any extensive plan at the present time. For instance, there is one resolve here—and it may perhaps be just as well to consider all of these in a way at the present time, because they cover the whole proposition—there is a resolve here calling, I think, for \$45,000 for the construction of a power

and central heating plant. Now it seems to me, and it seems to some others, that in view of the fact that there is already one boiler there, which is I think of 150 horsepower, already installed and in operation, and in view of the fact that all that is proposed, so far as I can learn, is that another boiler should be bought and a more permanent building built there, it seems to us that that sum is altogether excessive. But digressing for a moment and considering the past somewhat—although, of course, what already has been done cannot be helped, it might be a lesson to us for the future, and may perhaps have a bearing on that particular resolve! Here is a power plant where, as I understand it, coal is being transported from Pennsylvania, from West Virginia, to somewhere on top of this hill, and there is changed into electricity and the water conducted down the hill—I do not know how much of a declivity—and there used to pump water from the stream to this plant. Now on that stream, and as I understand it within the bounds of this institution, is a fall of 90 feet which would be available for running electricity or pumping water. Furthermore, I understand that that stream runs a continuous current the year around. I understand that one branch of that stream there has been in years past operated for a part of the year a saw mill, on one of the four branches of which that stream is made. On the main stream there is, I am quite positive, one saw-mill now, and I am not sure but what there are two in operation such part of the year as there is a demand for the sawing of lumber. Now the question is, whether if we are to appropriate any large amount of money for the institution in regard to a heating and lighting plant, it could not be put into a dam and a power plant on this 90-foot fall where there is plenty of water to run the electric plant or to light the institution and also to pump water to the building. So much for that resolve.

Now, as to the kitchen and bakery, I do not know particularly about the need for that further than this: That so far as I am able to learn the engine

and bakery are the most needed of any of the buildings proposed by this resolve. There are three carrying a large amount of money, one for kitchen and bakery, one for a power plant and one for a dormitory; and of these three I am informed by men who have investigated the matter that the kitchen and bakery is the most needed. Now the power plant should, in my judgment, not be provided for the reasons I have already stated. As to the dormitory, I don't know so much as to the merits of the case. I presume you will get that information from some other gentlemen on this floor. As to the resolve now under consideration, bear this in mind, that if these other buildings are not built this resolve is unnecessary and leads to a large expense. Furthermore, bear this also in mind, that there is also passed a resolve carrying \$7,000 more than was called for by the institution for maintenance on the ground that some of these buildings were to be built. This should become available for some other purposes in case all these buildings are not built. Furthermore, I will call attention to two other points. There has been passed a bill authorizing the sale of a farm, of one of the farms which was bought in connection with this property, from which it is expected to realize perhaps ten or twelve hundred dollars, and this sum is available by the terms of the act for the use of the institution. Furthermore, there has been appropriated here \$500 for the construction of a fence around the water pipes. I am told that some members of the committee offered to build the fence for \$200. Now if that estimate is anywhere near correct there should be \$200 more that is liable to be used for any other purpose. But as to that I cannot say. In view of these things, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen, it seems to me this resolve could be indefinitely postponed, and I therefore make that motion.

**Mr. ST. CLAIR:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in regard to the central heating plant, that that appropriation was made with the idea of saving the State money in this way: If this institution ever assumes the proportions it was intended to assume

so as to care for all the feeble-minded in the State, quite a large number more buildings would be needed than are there now for dormitories. The intention was to build a building of sufficient size and capacity to accommodate the institution when it arrived at its full growth. Now I am willing to admit, as the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, claims, that the building for the central kitchen and bakery is the one most needed; that that and the dormitory,—they need a new dormitory because they have not room for the patients they now have. If I could be sure that the House would pass those two resolves I should be content, and I don't know but what the institution ought to be content, and I think this Legislature will have done itself honor. I agree with the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, so far as that is concerned. The central heating plant perhaps can wait. They have been using as a kitchen a building such a long distance away that they had to haul the food after it was cooked something like a mile and a half, and by that time it gets cold. Now they ought not to have to use that kind of a building. It is an old farm building. I am willing to let this resolve go through, with that understanding.

**Mr. PIERCE** of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the consideration of House Doc. 675 be postponed until we settle the question about the dormitory and the central heating plant.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, yield to the suggestion of the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, that the House postpone further action of House Doc. 675 for the moment and proceed to consider the next matter on the calendar which is Senate Doc. 335 for the construction of a brick building for a central kitchen and bakery, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, tabled pending its second reading?

**Mr. PLUMMER:** Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolve be given its second reading.

**Mr. PERHAM** of Woodstock: Mr.

Speaker, I would like to say just a word on this whole proposition—

Mr. PIERCE: I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PIERCE: Is the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Perham, speaking against the passage of the present resolve? We are now considering, as I undersand it, Senate Doc. 335. It seems to me we would get ahead faster if we took these matter one at a time, but if the gentleman is speaking upon this particular resolve I have no objection.

Mr. PERHAM: I wish to say a word on both of these. I will say that I seem to be differently constituted than a good many people. I have been in this place; in fact, I have a friend up home who when that place was established made a very plain suggestion that it was being built for myself and other men in my town. I have been there to look over the property and the practicality of the whole scheme. It appealed to me greatly. I have suggested several times the expensive class of construction being insisted upon in our State institutions. Now I have a feeling that what is good enough for me in my own home is good enough for a lot of other people, and I object in a general way to the extensive and extravagant construction and furnishings of our State institutions, especially in this class where the major portion of them simply expect to stay and be made comfortable as long as they live. I think they could substitute comfortable wooden buildings such as nine-tenths of the people in this House live in, and that they would be good enough for the class of people there. I have seen buildings in that vicinity that could be converted into good dormitories where a colony of these unfortunate people could be kept in one farm house. You could have from 25 to 40 or 50 who could be accommodated in wooden buildings—they would not have the plumbing, heating and lighting that we are speaking about, but they would be as good as the most

of us have, and, Mr. Speaker, I should like to see that institution there, which is in its infancy, developed until it could take care of the major portion of those unfortunate people in our State, and they be supported and maintained at an expense that we can afford to stand. Now, as regards the central kitchen, I know they need a kitchen. I saw them carrying food a long distance in the cold last fall, but as a matter of fact these people should not be gathered together in a great institution with expensive buildings, with expensive lighting and heating plants, many of them only appreciating the simple fact that they are comfortable. I should like to see that institution on a practical basis with things such as are good enough for you and for me; I believe it can be done at a fractional part of the expense called for in these appropriations.

I was not a member of that committee. I have had plenty of other work to do, and I am willing to submit this question to the members of this House under the advice of the committee who have been on the ground, but that, Mr. Speaker, is my feeling in regard to this institution. I want it developed; I want it made as near self-supporting as it can be. I can see from a farmer's standpoint where there could be a lot of business done there along a line that the State needs, and that would go towards making those poor unfortunate people self-supporting.

Mr. EVANS of Bridgton: Mr. Speaker, I do not know as there is anything that I can add to what has been said. I think the gentleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair, has outlined the situation very fairly; but as a member of that committee I do not think I would be doing my duty by myself, this House or the State if I sat here and did not say a word in behalf of this institution. I wish that every member here might put in at least one day looking over the conditions that exist there. If there is an institution in this State, or any other State, that is more deserving than this one I have failed to see it. If there is a man here who can go through



that institution and see the people who are there, and if he does not see them in his dreams for a good many nights thereafter, he is a harder hearted man than I am. I do not think we should consider money in taking care of these unfortunates. They are doing a great work there, and they should be allowed to do a larger work. There are plenty of unfortunates all through this State who should be there and be taken care of; and when the gentleman from Woodstock. Mr. Perham, says that a place that is good enough for him or good enough for his neighbor is good enough for an institution, there are a great many things that he does not take into consideration. I suspect that he, like the majority of the people in the country, uses kerosene lights in his home. Now I want to ask any fair-minded man what you could do in an institution like that with kerosene lights? How long would you have a set of building in an institution of that kind, with that class of people, I would like to know. It is simply out of the question. So far as the idea of keeping it and running the plant by water power is concerned, it is possible that it might be done; but as far up the brook as I went I did not see any place where I thought the water power could be used to any extent, and I do not think the State would be any more anxious or willing to install a waterplant out there than they would be to give us a central kitchen or anything of that sort. They would talk about it here a week if we asked for money to go out there and build a dam. I am not going to talk any longer. I do not think it is necessary; but I will appeal to the humanity of this House, and I think there is plenty of it. Throw your politics away for a few minutes and consider the human side of this business, and if the officers, the trustees are abusing their privilege and are not giving us value received get rid of them and put in some trustees who will give us value received. I think instead of asking for too much, twice the sum we are asking for could be well expended. Just because some of the people who had

that institution in charge when it started made a mistake, I do not think it is any excuse for the people now to do it. I can see where when that institution was started mistakes were made, and the idea that was injected here this afternoon, if carried out, we would be just simply continuing along those lines. They should have had a central plant and those things at the beginning, and if they had we would not be here now asking for appropriations for them. That is one mistake, and I won't attempt to enumerate them all. If we pass this over, in two years from now they will be here asking for the same thing because it has got to come. That institution is bound to grow, and the heating plant and all those things have got to come. It is an institution that you cannot down, and I say that it is economy for the State that every building that is put up there should start right. If the institution is going to accomplish anything, I believe it is economy to put in a heating plant this year or the year to come that will take care of it for years. I hope the House will vote to grant every dollar that is asked for in these resolves. I do not conceive that we are asking for a cent too much; I do not think we are.

Mr. BLAKE of New Gloucester: Mr. Speaker, with reference to this stream that has been mentioned here where they could make their electricity for power and this heating plant, I think the trustees would have done that last year if they had money enough to put in the plant that is required there. Now on that stream is located the first woolen mill ever erected in the State of Maine—

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to suggest to the gentleman from New Gloucester, Mr. Blake, that the question now before the House is Senate Doc. 235, Resolve for the construction, equipment, service connections and furnishings of one brick building for a central kitchen and bakery at the Maine School for Feeble Minded

Mr. HIGGINS: And I understood the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer,

to move the second reading of the resolve.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the second reading.

The bill then received its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Senate Doc. 382, Resolve appropriating money for the construction of one brick dormitory for inmates at the Maine School for Feeble Minded, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, the pending question being the second reading of the resolve.

Mr. PIERCE: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I will endeavor to be very brief in this matter. The resolves appropriating money in excess of the ten mill income approximate \$700,000 as near as the figures can be collected. Now it is perfectly obvious as a matter of mathematics that all those resolves cannot be passed. We have either got to assume the responsibility of raising the tax rate, which no gentleman here seems to consider, or else some of these resolves have got to be turned down. Now it seems to me that the proper thing to do when you come to an institution like this to pick out the resolves which are most needed. First, your maintenance resolve has got to be passed or the doors of the institution must be closed. Then you come to the resolves for new buildings. Pick out the most important of those and let the others go. So far as the institution for feeble minded is concerned, the gentleman from Bridgton, Mr. Evans, suggests that there should be no politics in it. I think so myself, and I think the feeble minded should be taken care of; but I am not of the opinion that the feeble minded are quite in the same class of institutions so far as the support of the State is concerned as the educational institutions like the normal schools and the University of Maine or even the hospitals and the women's reformatory and a number of other things I might name. I do not believe that all these resolves should be passed in favor of this institution to the exclusion of some others. For that reason I wish to move that this resolve be indefinitely postponed, and what I say in this respect applies equally well to House Doc. 678 on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to and the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair now lays before the House Doc. 678, Resolve for the construction of a power and central heating plant at the Maine School for Feeble Minded, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the second reading of the resolve.

On motion by Mr. Plummer the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. 675, which was passed over temporarily, being Resolve providing for permanent outside service connection to present and proposed new buildings at the Maine School for Feeble Minded.

On motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton, the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act to authorize the Maine Central Railroad Company to retire a portion of its common stock and to issue bonds, notes or preferred stock in place thereof, tabled by the gentleman from Woodstock, Mr. Perham, the pending question being the passage of the bill to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Perham the bill was passed to be enacted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. 851, Resolve in favor of the Maine State Library, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, the pending question being the second reading of the resolve.

On motion by Mr. Pierce resolve was given its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, House Doc. 841, bill, An Act to provide for the destruction of dog fish and other members of the shark species, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Greenleaf, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Greenleaf moved that the bill

be indefinitely postponed, stating that this motion was made at the request of the gentleman from Nobleboro, Mr. Mulligan.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act relative to the employment of women and children, House Doc. 898, tabled by the gentleman from Bowdoinham, Mr. Bonney, the pending question being the second reading of the bill.

Mr. BONNEY: Mr. Speaker, when I tabled this bill I did it at the request of a gentleman in the House and without any knowledge of the provision of the bill. Since then I have taken occasion to look into the matter and I find that the bill was tabled pending the passage of some of these other matters of labor legislation—the 54-hour bill and the Workmen's Compensation bill. I have talked with several of the professional friends of labor in and about the House and also with some members on the floor of the House, and among them the distinguished gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. McCarty, who spoke so eloquently for the 54-hour bill, and they are agreed that this law which the bill proposes to repeal can very well be left on the statute books, and that it is working out satisfactorily that it is fair to the employer and to the employee. In addition to that, the fact that the 54-hour bill has passed so handsomely and the Workmen's Compensation bill has passed so successfully and happily, they have asked that this bill be indefinitely postponed; and I therefore make that motion.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House bill, An Act relative to the taxation of mortgage on real estate in savings banks and institutions for savings, Senate Doc. No. 392, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Greenleaf, the pending question being the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Greenleaf moved that the bill receive its third reading and be passed to be engrossed.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the exemption of savings banks from taxation to the extent that their funds are invested in real estate mortgages. The bill in my judgment is a just bill and might be carried even further than the investment in real estate mortgages, but the situation as I have outlined previously is that it is a pretty difficult thing for the state to figure out how it is going to get inside of a ten-mill appropriation. This bill would take from the State in the next year and a half, \$120,000, almost \$80,000 a year. Of course, the provisions of this bill would not become operative until the tax for this June had been paid; but if this bill is passed you must figure another \$120,000. This bill was before the committee on taxation and was reported favorably, but I desire to put in an amendment stating that it should not take effect until January first, 1917. My position is, and I reserve the right at a later time to offer an amendment to the bill putting it into effect at that time, for financial reasons. The gentleman from Dexter, Mr. Fay, has requested that this bill should be laid upon the table until Tuesday of next week because he did not expect to be here either today or tomorrow; and I make that motion, leaving it to the House to decide, and if the House does not wish to do so I will offer my amendment at this time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Brewer: Mr. Speaker, I will say that the gentleman from Dexter informed me that he was summoned home very hurriedly and if this bill came up in such form that any changes were to be suggested other than stated by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Greenleaf, he would like to have the matter laid upon the table until Tuesday of next week, although as I understand he does not object to the amendment which is to be introduced later by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer.

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House, bill, An Act relating to the illegal transportation of intoxicating liquors, tabled by the gen-

tleman from Calais, Mr. St. Clair, the pending question being the acceptance of the report of the committee reporting "ought not to pass."

Mr. St. Clair moved that the matter be reassigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. CLIFFORD of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this matter taken up and disposed of at this time. The committee on legal affairs gave this matter careful consideration and have submitted their unanimous report that it "ought not to pass." For that reason I would like to see the matter disposed of at this time.

The question being on the motion to reassign this matter for consideration on Tuesday of next week,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

The pending question being the acceptance of the report of the committee. The report of the committee was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf of Portland, the report was accepted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money to promote and assist the interests of poultry culture, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the final passage of the resolve.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to add anything to what I said the other day in regard to the poultry proposition further than to again call the attention of the House to the fact that no money has been heretofore appropriated in the assistance of poultry culture, and that the industry has not been taxed and it has not been helped, and that it is about the only agricultural industry that has made any rapid progress, and that it stands on its feet four-square to the world; and if we have not got any money to spend for the wards of the state in Pownal, why should we spend \$2,000 in the next two years to help people who, according to all statistics we get, are not only able to help themselves but are getting ahead? I move the indefinite postponement of this resolve.

Mr. COFFIN of Freeport: Mr. Speaker, I hate at this time to take up the time of the House in saying anything more about this poultry bill, and saying anything further than I have said previously. I have been here now for three months trying to fit into my place and do what I felt to be my duty in regard to all the interests of the State of Maine. I have not taken up much of the time of this House in talking about matters that I didn't know anything about; on all of those matters I have felt confident to rely upon the reports of our committees, and I believe that is the way the business of this House should have been done, and if it had been done in that way we would all have been glad to have gone home by this time to look after our chickens and whatever else we had to look after. It seems to me that it is absolutely useless and a piece of folly to keep tying up legislation the way we have here and then when a few of the members are absent for some one to get up and endeavor to move the indefinite postponement of measures.

In regard to this matter I wish to say that I introduced this resolve and it went before a committee and was acted upon by that committee. The original figures which were named in the resolve were cut down \$1,000, and that report received the unanimous support of the committee. The House here has accepted the report of the committee, and the resolve has received its several readings here and has been passed to be engrossed; the matter then went to the Senate and it was passed to be engrossed there; the resolve then came back here for its final passage, and the other day the gentleman from Lisbon (Mr. Plummer), according to his usual custom, moved that it be tabled, and it comes up here today. The resolve has considerable merit, and I do not see any reason why anybody should oppose it. I am not assuming to pose here as an expert in taxation, but I have a few figures here, and by these figures it is shown that the increase of taxes of the gentleman from Lisbon (Mr. Plummer) would be about 1-59th part of a mill if we were to go ahead and appropriate this money. This resolve does not call for any new com-

mission or anything of that sort; it is simply intended to reach out and help the poultry interests of this State, and I can not see any reason for the indefinite postponement of this resolve.

Mr. McINTIRE of Waterford: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, has told us that this is one industry in the State that does not need any help, and possibly that may be so, but if they are successful and if it is a profitable business, I can not see any reason why they should not be recognized. The gentleman further says that this industry is not taxed. Perhaps he does not take into consideration this fact, that this is one step in the process whereby they will be taxed. This is recognized now as a business, and after a reasonable amount is allowed to every farmer who keeps a few hens this surplus will be taxed, I am very sure.

The question being on the motion to indefinitely postpone the resolve,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

On motion by Mr. Coffin of Freeport, the resolve then received a final passage

---

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House resolve appropriating money for the completion of the Aroostook county farm, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the final passage of the resolve.

The question being on the motion to indefinitely postpone the resolves,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

On motion by Mr. Coffin of Freeport the resolve then received a final passage.

---

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve appropriating money for the completion of the Aroostook County Farm, tabled by the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, the pending question being the final passage of the resolve.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal privilege, I would like to state that being a little sensitive I hate to have my friend from Freeport (Mr. Coffin) or anyone else call the attention of the House to the

fact that I know so much. I would like to state this, that if I make any error or any misstatement here on the floor of the House I will be very glad to have it corrected, but the mere fact that I make some suggestions on one or two points now and then I do not think should of itself militate against the proposition upon which I am talking one way or another. The situation is that somebody has got to go without money during the next two years that they perhaps ought to have; all that we can do is to decide who this money is going to and who has got to go without. We might just as well start out with that proposition now.

We have before us at the present time a resolve for the completion of the purchase of a farm in Aroostook County which was purchased by representatives of the State for express purposes. I will give you briefly the history of this farm and all proceedings relating to it. Two years ago there came to this Legislature a resolve for the purchase of a farm in Aroostook County for experimental purposes with regard to the farm products of that county. That resolve carried an appropriation of \$25,000—or possibly it may have been for \$20,000—which amount was to cover the purchase of the farm and the expense for carrying it on for two years. The committee to which that matter was referred reported a resolve carrying the sum of \$10,000, as against the \$20,000 or \$25,000 that was requested. A committee was named in connection with that matter which was authorized to purchase a farm in Aroostook County; and those gentlemen travelled all over that county, and I don't intend here to say anything to reflect upon the honesty or integrity of those gentlemen or anything of that kind; I have every reason for believing that they acted with honest intent and purpose; but the situation was that they had \$10,000 to do business with, to buy a farm and carry it on for the next two years. This committee finally decided to purchase a farm within about a mile of the village of Presque Isle. I guess without any doubt it is a good

farm; as I understand it, it is a farm consisting of somewhere about 250 or 275 acres of land. There was a barn on this farm worth something like \$2,000 or \$3,000. The price paid for that farm was \$20,000; and I understand that in the committee there was some difference of opinion as to whether that was an advisable thing to do in purchasing that farm; but finally the farm was bought and the money was raised, the balance of the purchase price of the farm by the citizens of Presque Isle, and the State furnished the additional money over the \$10,000, so that the \$10,000 of the State and the \$10,000 of these individuals was put into the farm. Afterwards they raised something like \$3,000 more to build some kind of a building on the farm. There was no money left to carry the farm along with. The Bangor and Aroostook Railroad, as I understand, put up \$2,500 for conducting experiments on the part of the State, and then that railroad came here to the State and would like to have its taxes rebated. The United States Government also wanted to equip a farm up in that region for experimental purposes, but the United States Government did not go to that farm, but went to Caribou and hired a farm and conducted its experiments there. This farm at Presque Isle was not bought until some time in the fall of 1913, and these things happened in 1914 in regard to the United States Government going there. So that if the committee had decided to wait until this year it would only have put back their experiments something like a year.

One other thing I wish to call to your attention. I claim that these gentlemen on that committee exceeded their authority, and this is not the first time such a thing has been done, and in all probability it will not be the last time if you encourage such propositions by putting this resolve through now. My idea is this, and I shall make a motion that this resolve be indefinitely postponed,—but my idea is that you should let these men carry on that farm, not because I have anything against those men, but for the same reason that we have to put peo-

ple in state's prison, to prevent them from committing another like act.

I wrote on the twelfth of March to the chairman of the Board of Selectmen of Presque Isle as follows: "Will you kindly give me figures of the assessed value of the farm purchased by the State for experimental purposes, according to your books for the year 1913?" In reply I received the following: "The tax valuation for 1913 was \$7,750. This is at about 40 per cent of real value. Since then the house has been built. This at about the same ratio on valuation as the other farms in the town."

Now, in view of these facts, I am going to move that this resolve be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SNOW of Mars Hill: Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the last Legislature saw fit to make an appropriation for a farm in Aroostook County to be used in connection with the Maine Experimental Station, and as it has been stated, the Legislature made an appropriation of \$10,000. This committee which was appointed visited the towns of Fort Fairfield, Presque Isle and Caribou and had under consideration a number of farms. They finally met in Presque Isle and decided that the Greenwood farm in Presque Isle was better situated and offered better conditions than any other farm for their work. They only had \$10,000, and the people of Presque Isle said that they would put up the balance of the money with the understanding that the next Legislature might be asked for that money in return, as I understand it. Now, gentlemen, you have got \$10,000 in that farm already. You have already passed a resolve appropriating \$10,000, to be divided giving \$5000 for 1915 and \$5000 for 1916 for the maintenance of this farm. This farm is deeded one-half undivided interest to the State, as I understand it, and the other half is held by the gentlemen who put up the \$13,000. This property was turned over to the management of the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, as provided in the act of the last Legislature. Now, I ask you, gentlemen, do you want those men to keep their money in there while the State

uses this farm, or would it not be better to put through a resolve here making an appropriation sufficient to finish buying that farm. There will be no loss to the State; you are buying that farm, and it is a good farm. I believe the men who bought that farm bought it just as cheap as anybody could buy a farm situated as this farm is. You can not buy a farm in that county situated where that farm is for anything less than \$20,000. I don't care what the assessed value of the farm is; it seems to me that has nothing to do with this question. It seems to me it can not be otherwise than a good proposition to finish paying for that farm. This farm will never decrease in value, but whether it decreases or not, and I question whether it ever will to any material extent, but as I claim this farm will always be worth as much as it has cost. The town of Presque Isle last month voted to pay the interest on that \$13,000 when the State made their appropriation, so you have no interest to pay for last year, or whatever accrued interest there is, the town of Presque Isle will take care of. The federal government has also come to Presque Isle and the people of Presque Isle have built a building there that has cost \$3500 for the federal government. I understand that they came there because the State had bought this farm and they want the use of some sixty acres of that farm on which to carry on their experiments in connection with the State of Maine, and it is a good proposition. The government is doing a great work for our farmers. I submit to you, gentlemen, one thing that has been a benefit to our farmers to the extent of perhaps a million dollars to our county alone, and that was what is known as the Bordeaux mixture, a mixture to spray upon our potatoes to keep the rust off, and I claim that that one thing has done more than anything else to build up the potato industry in Aroostook county. I hope that this resolve will receive a passage.

Mr. GREENLAW of Presque Isle: Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mars Hill, Mr. Snow, says, this farm

as it stands today is a great benefit to the people of our county. Two years ago, as has been stated, the State appropriated \$10,000 to buy the farm and also appointed a committee. That committee looked over farms in different parts of the county and finally decided to buy this farm located in Presque Isle, and as it did not have any house on it they bought it for \$20,000. They decided that if the people of Presque Isle would furnish the other \$10,000 and \$3000 to build the house that they would buy this farm. I do not think that this committee over-reached their power in buying the farm in the least. They did not put the State under any obligation in buying it. The people of Presque Isle paid for the farm, or became good for it, and took a deed of one-half of the farm, and at the present time the citizens of Presque Isle own one undivided half of this farm and the State of Maine owns the other undivided half. I don't know the reason why the federal government did not come there at first, but I have understood that it was something that came up between them and Mr. Woods of the Maine Experimental Station, as near as I can find out. But they came down there last fall and put up the proposition to the Presque Isle people that they wanted a building in which to do their scientific work, and a few of the people of the town went out and bought an acre and a half of land that was on the same road and built a building, and the land and building cost something like \$3500. The people put their hands into their pockets and paid for it, and they are not asking the State to pay one cent of that amount, and they never will ask the State to pay for this building; they have simply done it as a business proposition. The federal government rented those buildings for one year only, and they are coming there in connection with the State Experimental Station and do their work, and it won't be a cent of cost to the State, to the county, or to the town. I have received a letter from a man in that vicinity and from that letter I learn that there was a schoolhouse on the lot, and in this letter it is said that the town voted to pay interest on the

State farm notes, and also to convey to the State the piece of land and the school building located on what was a part of the State farm as soon as the State has paid over the \$13,000 to pay for the balance of the farm. This schoolhouse cost \$2,000 to build, and this building will be turned over to the State with the land, and there is no question in regard to the federal government coming there this year if they can get a chance to work. I do not believe this House is going to turn down this proposition. During this session of the Legislature I have voted for money to go all over the State without regard to politics or anything else; whatever I thought was needed I have voted for, and I believe that the members of this House will vote to buy the balance of this farm.

Mr. PIERCE of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, this resolve should have gone before the committee on claims. I think the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, is in error in this respect, when these people found that they could not get this farm for \$10,000 they took the matter up by letter with Gov. Haines with regard to the other \$10,000, and Gov. Haines sent them back word, and that letter was before the committee, to go ahead and it would be all right for them to spend \$20,000 and buy the farm, and that the next Legislature would undoubtedly reimburse them. I am not defending the action of the Governor, as to whether it was advisable or not, but I do not think it is fair that these people up there in the town of Presque Isle should be obliged to put their money into this proposition under the written advice of the Governor of the State of Maine and should be obliged to lose it, and I think that the State of Maine should reimburse them for what they have spent acting under the advice of the Governor of the State of Maine. At the time he wrote this letter Gov. Haines was the Governor of the State of Maine, and his word was supposed to carry a good deal of weight, and I think it is only fair to let bygones be bygones and that it is only proper and right that these people should have their money, and I

hope that this resolve will be passed by this House.

Mr. THOMBS of Lincoln: Mr. Speaker, I believe that my constituents will be only too glad to endorse me in saying that this matter should be agreed upon in behalf of those people up there in the northern part of our State, and that the State should take hold and do its proper share, not only for the benefit of Aroostook County, but for the benefit of the whole State of Maine.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, I think that this committee did exceed its authority, and as sustaining that position I want to read a section from the Revised Statutes, Section 95 of Chapter two says: "No agent or officer of the state or of any department thereof whose duty it is to expend money under an appropriation by the legislature shall contract any bill or incur any obligation on behalf of the state in excess of the appropriation, and whoever exceeds in his expenditure such appropriation shall not have any claim for reimbursement." It seems to me that that is plain English, as I understand it. Further along it says: "any such agent shall upon conviction be fined a sum and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court." As far as I am concerned, I am not inclined to take any action against Gov. Haines and the committee who bought this farm, nor shall I institute any criminal prosecution, and I am willing that they should keep the money.

The question being on the motion to indefinitely postpone this resolve,

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

On motion by Mr. Snow of Mars Hill, the resolve was then finally passed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair lays before the House Resolve in favor of the State Board of Charities and Corrections, tabled by the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Pierce, the pending question being the final passage of the resolve.

Mr. Pierce moved that the resolve be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Higgins of Brewer seconded the motion.



The motion was agreed to, and the resolve was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Connors of Bangor reports A and B of the committee on judiciary on bill, An Act relating to the charter of the city of Bangor, were taken from the table.

On further motion by Mr. Connors, report A, being the majority report of the committee, reporting in a new draft under same title and that it "ought to pass", was accepted.

This bill having been already printed, and being House Doc. No. 929,

Mr. Connors then moved that the bill receive its two several readings at this time, under a suspension of the rules.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill then received its first and second readings and was assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer, bill, An Act to provide for semi-monthly payments on account of State contracts was taken from the table.

Mr. Higgins then yielded to the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Perkins.

On motion by Mr. Perkins, the rules were suspended and the bill received its first and second readings at this time.

Mr. Perkins then offered House Amendment A, to amend by adding thereto the following: "Nothing herein contained shall be construed to relieve the State, its officers, boards and commissioners from paying mechanics, workmen and laborers employed by it or them, as provided by Chapter 39 of the Public Laws of 1911, and acts amendatory thereof."

The amendment was adopted.

On further motion by Mr. Perkins the rules were suspended and the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed as amended.

On motion by Mr. Brann of Winthrop, House Doc. No. 886, bill, An Act relating to the abolishment of grade crossings of railroads, was taken from the table.

The pending question being the third reading of the bill,

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

On motion by Mr. Greenleaf of Portland, House Doc. No. 890, bill, An Act to provide for the disposition of contraband liquors was taken from the table.

The pending question being the third reading of the bill,

Mr. Greenleaf moved that the bill be specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon, House Doc. No. 892, bill, An Act to incorporate the Bath Water District, was taken from the table.

The pending question being the third reading of the bill,

Mr. Plummer offered House Amendment A, to amend by striking out the whole of Section 15 and inserting in place thereof of the following:

"Section 15. Before the said water district shall construct any plant under the provisions of this act it shall purchase the plant and property of the Maine Water Company within the county of Sagadahoc, in the town of Brunswick, provided said company desires to sell; and said company is authorized to sell. The procedure shall be as follows, when this act shall take effect in accordance with the provisions of Section 14 the city clerk of Bath shall notify the said Maine Water Company by registered letter directed to its office, if within twenty days thereafter said company shall send in writing to said city clerk its decision to sell it shall within a reasonable time deliver to the trustees of said water district suitable deeds or other instruments conveying its plant and property to said district, and said water district shall pay to said company a fair value thereof to be ascertained according to the provisions of Section 9; provided further that said value shall be estimated by said appraisers without enhancement on account of future earning capacity or on account of the franchises of said company."

The amendment was adopted.

On motion by Mr. Corliss of Bath the

vote was reconsidered whereby this amendment was adopted.

Mr. SANBORN of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, at the hearing on this matter the representatives of the new proposed water district put in their case and there was some opposition on the part of the present water company, and by arrangement the attorney for the water company, Mr. Wheeler, and the attorney for the water district, Mr. Trott, I think, got together and reconciled their differences and made some changes in the bill and returned it to the committee with the statement that it was mutually satisfactory. That was the position in which the matter was placed before the committee.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, the situation is this: we all know that the city of Portland was mulched to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars when it took over the water works in that city. The city of Waterville also lost a large amount of money, and the same thing was true in regard to the city of Auburn. It seems to me that the time has now come when we should take some different action in relation to these matters pertaining to water districts, and we should either stop all this great cry about watered stock or we should stop compelling every city that wants a water district to pay for these large amounts of watered stock. This company has had a charter in the city of Bath for some 25 or 30 years, and it has got out all the chance that there is in going into business, and it has got it all out by this time; and I say that the time must come when these franchises are no longer to be taken into consideration in taking over this property; the time must come when these franchises which have been given to these companies must be stopped. It is a loan and not a gift of a State power, and at any time when the State sees fit to take them back or grant to any people who are directly concerned the right to take them back, it should come back without having to be paid for.

Now, as to the Maine Water Com-

pany being a kind of altruistic institution, I want to call attention to a bill which has been before this Legislature. There was a bill before this Legislature empowering this Maine Water Company in order to supply water to the city of Bath to go to Sabbathday Lake, which is located away up in the locality of the Home for Feeble-Minded, something like a distance of twenty miles away. It was openly whispered around here that the object of getting that charter was so as to have more rights, more franchises and water rights to charge the city of Bath for when they wanted to take that over. Now, this was not a new proposition. Some time about twenty years ago, the city of Newburyport in Massachusetts took over the water plant there under substantially the same conditions. As a matter of fact, this amendment so far as it applies to this situation is practically and identically a copy of the act under which the city of Newburyport took over the Newburyport Water Company. Appraisers were appointed in that case, and in reporting they figured up as near as might be the value of the plant as it existed at that time and then they added something like \$40,000 for the company as a going concern. It was expressly provided in the act that neither the future earnings, the capacity of the company, nor its good will, nor the franchises of said company should be taken into consideration, and in reporting on that fact on the appraisal the commission stated that they did not take into consideration those things, and the courts of Massachusetts held that it was perfectly proper; but in this State every time these companies have been taken over in these places which I have mentioned there has been a big sum put in because of the value of the franchises of the company. There is nothing in this amendment that prevents the city of Bath from paying any amount of money it wants to pay for that water works; there is nothing to prevent it from paying for the value of those franchises, because it is provided that these appraisers would have to take into

consideration of the value of the franchises. As to any agreements that may have been entered into between a committee representing this Bath Water District and the Maine Water Company, this Legislature is not here to ratify agreements between private parties; this Legislature is here for the purpose of deciding what it will do for itself.

The pending question being on the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, that House Amendment A be adopted, and a viva voce vote being doubted,

Mr. Pierce of Houlton called for a division of the House.

Mr. Higgins of Brewer then moved that the matter be tabled until Tuesday of next week.

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, as far as that is concerned, I will say that I personally have no objection to its being tabled if such action will not retard the business of the House.

The question being on the motion to table this matter until Tuesday of next week,

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Connors of Bangor the vote was reconsidered whereby the

House voted to assign for its third reading tomorrow bill, An Act relating to the charter of the city of Bangor.

Mr. Connors then moved that the bill be specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week, stating that this motion was made by agreement.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Pierce of Houlton, Resolve appropriating money for maintenance of the Bureau of Horticulture, was taken from the table.

The pending question being the final passage of the resolve,

On further motion by Mr. Pierce the resolve was finally passed.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer, unanimous consent was granted and that gentleman presented out of order under a suspension of the rules the following order:

Ordered, That all acts and resolves tabled and unassigned be taken from the table Tuesday next, March 30th.

The order received a passage.

On motion by Mr. Higgins of Brewer,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.