

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

Eighty-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1933

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

ERRATA:

**The following errata are
inserted because one or more pages
in this session day have errors
noticed and corrected here.**

- Page 473—An act to regulate the speed of motor vehicles (S. P. 357, L. D. 572)—Should be (S. P. 357, L. D. 512)
- Page 474—An Act to incorporate the Maine Reinsurance Company (H. P. 977, L. D. 313)—Should be (H. P. 877, L. D. 313)
- Page 475—Second act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing to be deleted.
- Page 478—Resolve regulating Fishing in Snow Mountain Pond (H. P. No. 462) (L. D. No. 228)—Should be (H. P. No. 562) (L. D. No. 228)
- Page 486—An Act relating to trapping muskrats in Sourdabscook Stream (H. P. 5351, L. D. 142)—Should be (H. P. 551, L. D. 142)
- Page 487—An Act providing for the calling of conventions for adoption or rejection of proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States submitted by Congress to conventions.—Should be H. P. 1594.
- Page 487—House Paper 205, An act relating to the prepayment of taxes—Should be L. D. 205.
- Page 495—An Act empowering William L. Milliken of Presque Isle in the County of Aroostook to Erect and Maintain Piers, Piles and Booms in the Aroostook River (H. P. 67) (L. D. 85)—Should be (H. P. 67) (L. D. 29)
- Page 504—resolve providing for a State pension for Leland Palmer of Carmel H. P. 685, L. D. 727—Should be H. P. 645, L. D. 737.
- Page 509—An Act to establish a board of finance of the City of Waterville. (H. P. 1551, L. D. 860)—Should be (H. P. 1551, L. D. 868)
- Page 537—Resolve providing for a state pension for Anne Foley of Lewiston (H. P. 907, L. D. 340)—Should be (H. P. 907, L. D. 840)
- Page 537—Resolve in favor of American Liability Insurance Company of Boston in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (S. P. 206)—Should read American Mutual Liability Insurance Company.
- Page 538—"An Act relating to beautification of landscape and roadsides" (S. P. 385)—Should be (S. P. 355)
- Page 567—An Act providing for sentences and the imposition thereof. (S. P. 596, L. D. 568)—Should be (S. P. 283, L. D. 568)
- Page 569—Error in spelling (the county).
- Page 571—"An Act relative to the fishing in the Mousam River" (S. P. 173)—Should be (S. P. 178).
- Page 587—(S. P. No. 564) (L. D. No. 832) Resolve regulating fishing for Pickerel in Oxford and York Counties.—Should be in York County.
- Page 587—(H. P. 560, L. D. 144) Resolve regulating fishing for pickerel in Oxford and York Counties.
- Page 600—Resolve appropriating money to pay World War Veterans claims heretofore approved by the Committee on Claims (S. P. 892, L. D. 948)—Should be (S. P. 592, L. D. 948)
- Page 601—Resolve extending open season on Mousam River. (S. P. 610, L. D. 993)—Should be (S. P. 610, L. D. 983)
- Page 601—The majority of the Committee on Bill "An Act relating to manufacture of intoxicating liquor" (S. P. 116, L. D. 163)—should read—The majority of the Committee on Temperance, etc.
- Page 601—The majority of the Committee on Bill "An Act relating to the pauperizing of unemployed wage earners" (S. P. 42, L. D. 26) should read—The majority of the Committee on Labor, etc.
- Page 601—(Signed) Holmes of Franklin—Should be Holman.
- Page 602—"An act relating to state aid for academies." (S. P. 1000, L. D. 577)—Should be (H. P. 1090, L. D. 577)
- Page 621—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Augusta O. Goodwin of Augusta, (H. P. 75) (L. D. 670)—Should be (H. P. 75) (L. D. 671)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Lester Pagen of Hermon (H. P. 56) (L. D. 706)—Should be Lester Patten.
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Arria S. Sargent of Auburn, (H. P. 383) (L. D. 08)—Should be (H. P. 383) (L. D. 708)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for a State Pension for Fred E. Stevens of Chelsea, (H. P. 991) (L. D. 40)—Should be (H. P. 991) (L. D. 740)
- Page 622—Resolve Providing for an Increase in State Pension for Grace Griffin of Auburn, (H. P. 139) (L. D. 715)—Should be (H. P. 1397) (L. D. 715)
- Page 623—Resolve Providing for a Pension for Laura Witham of Lisbon, (S. P. 535) (L. D. 788)—Should be (S. P. 535) (L. D. 799)
- Page 633—Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes and seminaries (S. P. 598, L. D. 932)—Should be (S. P. 598, L. D. 942)
- Page 633—An act requiring the licensing of operators of creameries or milky distributing plants (H. P. 1618) (L. D. 953)—Should be milk distributing plants.
- Page 635—An act relating to Penobscot and Passamaquoddy Tribes of Indians (H. P. 1554, L. D. 875)—Should be (H. P. 1554, L. D. 857)

SENATE

Friday, March 10, 1933.

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. A. T. McWhorter of Augusta.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair wishes to state that while members of the Legislature over night heard rumors of the Legislature being held in session tomorrow and Monday morning for the purpose of enacting emergency banking legislation, the occasion for those rumors has its foundation not in any situation in the State of Maine but entirely in the desire of the officials of the State of Maine to enact legislation in accordance with a Federal program if that Federal program should call for such legislation.

It is stated that much disturbance has been created by these rumors. The Chair wishes to impress upon the Senate, if possible, that there is no occasion for that disturbance. Our situation in Maine is no worse than it was and it is infinitely better than in most of the states. Evidence of that fact was found in the result. The bankers and the bank commissioner have conferred with the Governor and, except for one bill that is pending before the Legislature and is in position for enactment in the normal course this morning, there is nothing to present before the Legislature today regarding that situation and there is no thought of holding the Legislature tomorrow. The adjournment today will be until late Monday afternoon or evening as is customary at this stage of the session.

The fate of the banks of the State of Maine and the fate of the people of the State of Maine insofar as it depends upon the banks rests entirely with the people of the State of Maine and upon whether they retain their sanity and do not force the continued closing of the banks. It is anticipated that the banks in the State of Maine will open with the other banks as the Federal government opens them, but in the condition that we are in with more money on deposit than there is money it is obvious to anyone who stops to think that not all of the people can withdraw all their money at any one time. The fate of the situation rests with the people. If they retain their calmness and sanity everything will be well.

If they permit hysteria to govern them no one can forecast what is going to happen.

The members of this Senate and the members of the Legislature as a whole can accomplish a great good by trying to keep the people calm and patient, and as we go home over the week-end that ought to be our first duty.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

On motion by Mr. Seavey of Oxford, out of order and under suspension of rules, it was

Ordered, the House concurring that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet Monday, March 13th, at four-thirty o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 582)

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Jackson of Sagadahoc, the rules were suspended and that Senator presented out of order the following order and moved its passage:

Ordered, that in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court are hereby respectfully requested to give to the Senate their opinion as to the legality and the constitutionality of Legislative Document 727, "An Act to create and allocate a general highway fund for state aid and third class highway construction, and to temporarily suspend certain statutes."

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Weeks of Somerset, the order was laid upon the table pending passage.

From the House:

Bill "An Act authorizing Knox County to issue bonds." (H. P. 875, L. D. 312)

Recalled from the Engrossing Department by Joint Order, under suspension of the rules passage to be engrossed reconsidered.

In the House, House Amendment "A" adopted and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; House Amendment "A" was read and adopted and the bill as so

amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

From the House:

Bill "An Act relative to the conveyance of pupils." (S. P. 208, L. D. 277)

(In the Senate on March 3rd passed to be engrossed.)

In the House, House Amendment "A" adopted and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A," in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, the rules were suspended and the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; House Amendment "A" was read and adopted and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Papers from the House disposed of in concurrence.

House Bills in First Reading

An Act relating to trapping muskrats in Sourdabscok Stream. (H. P. 551, L. D. 142)

An Act relative to partridge or ruffed grouse. (H. P. 689, L. D. 339)

An Act to change the time for holding the annual town meeting of the Town of Sanford, York County, Maine, and for other purposes. (H. P. 628, L. D. 294)

From the House:

The Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act for the regulation of the practice of hairdressing and cosmetic therapy" (H. P. 1013, L. D. 421) (together with Remonstrance H. P. 1147) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1513, L. D. 823) under a new title "An Act for the regulation of the practice of hairdressing and beauty culture" and that it ought to pass.

In the House, House Amendment "A" adopted and passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A."

In the Senate:

The PRESIDENT: Is it the pleasure of the Senate that the bill as amended be passed to be engrossed in concurrence?

Mr. ROBIE of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would like to register my vote as being opposed to the concurrence with the House on that bill.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Senator desire a division?

Mr. ROBIE: I do, Mr. President. Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Page of Somerset, the bill was laid

upon the table, pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.

From the House:

The majority of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act relating to the legal size of lobsters and method of measurement" (H. P. 110, L. D. 54) reported that the same ought to pass.

(Signed)

WENTWORTH of Kennebunk
NEWCOMB of Scarborough
LEWIS of Boothbay
RICHARDSON of South Portland

McLOON of Knox
LITTLEFIELD of York

The minority of the same Committee on the same subject reported that the same ought not to pass. (Signed)

SMITH of Vinalhaven
SHAW of Milbridge
BLAISDELL of Hancock
PEACOCK of Lubec

In the House the Minority Report "ought not to pass" accepted.

In the Senate:

Mr. McLOON of Knox: Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the Majority Report "ought to pass" and I ask that this be done as a courtesy in order that the bill may have its first reading and that I may later present an amendment which is a compromise which I believe will be acceptable to the House.

Mr. BLAISDELL of Hancock: Mr. President, affecting a very definite and a very substantial size and number of our citizens is the bill which is now before you. This is the lobster bill of which we have all heard.

I oppose the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator McLoon. The lobster fishermen of this State have registered in no uncertain terms their attitude relative to the changing of our lobster laws. For those who may be in doubt, let me say that the present law provides that it is legal for us to catch and kill lobsters of ten and a half inches in length, the common, accepted length. This bill will provide that you will be allowed to take a nine inch lobster from the water. It is important because it vitally affects our coastwise fishermen, quite a substantial number. There are a great many people who are entirely dependent upon this industry. Let's see who, and how many. In 1929 there were 5000 fishermen in the State of Maine fishing for lobsters. These fishermen were fish-

ing our 4000 miles of the coastline of the State of Maine and our 5000 rivers, harbors, bays and streams. Washington County had 755 lobster fishermen. Hancock County had 800 lobster fishermen, and in Hancock County, let me say, in that county alone 79 more lobster fishermen than in the whole state of Massachusetts. Knox County had some 700 lobster fishermen. Lincoln County had 650 lobster fishermen. Combining Sagadahoc and Cumberland County gave us 700 lobster fishermen; and York County 281 lobster fishermen. That was in 1929. I admit that from that date down to the present date, there has been a marked decline in the number of lobster fishermen, so that I am now prepared to say to you there are approximately 2770 lobster fishermen working in this State today; 4000 homes are dependent upon the lobster industry in this State; 23,000 wives, mothers and children are dependent entirely upon the result of the catch in this industry. The schools, homes, education and taxes and entire community life of the citizens up and down the Maine coast are entirely dependent upon this industry. Enough for those dependent upon it. Now, in 1929 practically the same identical bill, or a bill that would accomplish the same identical results as the bill that is before us was presented and the Legislature at that session did not see fit to pass it. And I call that to your attention as the cry will be today that we must reduce the lobster in length in order to keep the industry alive. The cry will be to save the industry, save the fisherman and save the dealer; but they presented the identical same bill in 1929 when we never had such good times in all the world, so I rather question why all the argument. This is not the first time this has been before the Legislature, or one that would accomplish identically the same purpose, so there must be other motives which underlie the purpose which brings the bill before you. What are they?

With the utmost respect for my friends, the Senators from York County, and my friends, the Senators from Cumberland County,—they must know the reason why this bill appears. The fishermen of York County have not seen fit to abide by the strict requirements of the law; and that holds true in

some sections of Cumberland County, with the result that the western waters of Cumberland County and the waters of York County have been sadly depleted of lobsters. Verification of the fact? Yes. I think I can say what I am saying with honesty and truthfulness, because I religiously attended every hearing and religiously listened to what they said when there were hundreds of them here, and they said what they thought because all of us who were on the committee heard them.

What did they say? A prominent lobster fisherman of York County said, 'I can put out 150 traps and my lobster catch is 10.' What is the reason? They complain because they are not catching any fish, or any lobsters. Why aren't they catching any? We will go to Two Lights in Cape Elizabeth, and we will go eastward until we come to Eastport. What are lobster fishermen in those sections accomplishing? From Bailey's Island, I have a faithful and authentic record of a fisherman who religiously keeps an accurate record of what he does. He was catching from 111 to 197 lobsters in a haul of 200 traps. The lobster fishermen in Hancock County are not complaining of the present law. They are not complaining in Washington County of the present law. They are not complaining in any of those places where they have tried to reasonably abide by the provisions of the law and they are now catching lobsters. The depression has driven a large number of lobster men out of business. We admit it.

The depression has driven a large number of dealers out of the business. We will admit that. But is there anyone here who will say the rest of us are not being driven out of business? The granite business of the State of Maine is falling flat, and I know something of that. The lumbering business of the State has long since fallen flat. The pulpwood industry of the State of Maine know where they are at, and the potato men of Aroostook County know where they are at. Is it any wonder one or two thousand fishermen went out of business, and is it any wonder where there were eight dealers there are now about three? Isn't it perfectly logical?

In the heat and battle of the hearing I took occasion to ask one of the dealers who was there, what was the percentage of evil in the

law, and the evil of the depression? He said, 'We can get by wonderfully. Ninety per cent of the trouble with the dealer is the law, and only ten per cent is with the depression.' Certainly members of the committee here heard that. Let's see how reasonable it is. No, in fact, I think I will dismiss it on the grounds that perhaps it would be an insult to your intelligence. Ninety per cent trouble with the law isn't the trouble with my business, and ninety per cent trouble with the law isn't the trouble with the pulpwood business. It is the reverse. Ninety per cent is with the unfortunate trouble we find ourselves in, and perhaps ten per cent of the trouble is with the law, but I doubt that. They tell you it will save the industry.

Let's talk about the lobster, himself. He is a very interesting subject. The nine inch lobster does not spawn and reproduce itself except rarely. From nine to ten and a half inches that lobster spawns and reproduces itself once, and possibly twice. It takes 21 months for the term of the egg to find itself floating around on the surface of the ocean in the form of life. The nine or ten inch lobster lays approximately 10,555 eggs in proportion to the capacity of her body. After they are carried on her body ten months and thrown off at maturity, they rise to the surface to get the sunlight or the warmer waters, and there they have to stay, those tiny things;—I can hardly explain them,—for a period of four weeks, possibly five weeks, where they undergo four or five separate changes, and at the fifth change of life which takes place in that little, tiny mass, the lobster takes a general shape and form and it is then only about one-third of an inch long, and it begins to exercise the instinct inherent in it and it finds its way to the bottom and climbs in among the rocks and weeds and under the sand, and there it stays for almost three years. That is what happens to the little fellow. Now then, during the four or five weeks in which that little tiny thing is living on the surface of the water, how perfectly possible such a gale of wind as we have on the outside today could wash millions and millions and millions of them on the shore never to produce an adult lobster. It becomes the prey of every single thing

that swims in the water. What is the proportion of life—mortality? One lobster survives to be an adult in 15,000 eggs. Why talk about this? I will tell you why. We talk about it because if you catch a nine-inch lobster he never has a chance to reproduce himself, but if you let him stay until he is ten and a half inches, he has a chance to reproduce once and possibly twice.

We will go back and see beyond the limit of that small lobster and in the upper scales of the longer lengths we will find the lobster which is an egg bearing lobster, which is required by law to be thrown over, by having a hole bored in the middle flipper of his tail, which will identify him, and it is close time on that lobster. I will agree with that, but this they won't tell you when they get to that particular point,—there are times when they are not carrying eggs on the outside of their body. Let me bring out the point that for nine or ten months the egg is carried on the inside and ten or twelve months on the outside of the body. How simple it is, as we all know, for the lobster fisherman, if he is not honest with himself and the industry and the law as a whole, to take the lobster, what we call the "buried" lobster, when it is carrying eggs on its tail, sweep them off and clean the lobster, and she goes into the market. That is the lobster which is presumably to be protected because it is a bearing-seed lobster, but if it hasn't a hole bored in its tail, it is subject to being caught and killed by dishonest fishermen. The life of the lobster when she begins to reproduce herself is three or four years old, and if we are permitted to destroy the young, there can never be any old lobsters.

It is interesting, in the State of Maine, to show the result of illegal and improper fishermen who are unwilling to abide by the law of the State, because in York County and sections of Cumberland County, they cannot catch enough. In our county they are not making any money, but are holding their own.

The instinct of the lobster does not permit him to migrate up and down the river. Funny thing as it may be, he migrates in shore and off shore, and then not very far. Only one fathom or six feet to 100 fathoms. He moves in and out. In April and May they move in. The

female who is carrying eggs remains out two months or longer so she can lay eggs under better conditions, and then she moves in and becomes prey to the trapper.

During the time it takes for a lobster to mature, four years or three years, I say to you, if we are permitted to catch these lobsters before they have an opportunity to reproduce themselves once,—it has been suggested that we try it for a period of two years, and if we do, it will take ten years to recover from the damage done in two years.

Now, all of a sudden we find ourselves at this particular time and with this particular law, confronted with the dealers walking hand in hand with the fishermen who are opposed to the present law.

There is no legislation passed in this state to save me in my industry and I doubt if there is any legislation being passed to save any of the rest of you in your industries, but here is a case where legislation is proposed which would be directly to the betterment of the dealer and to the everlasting loss of the fisherman himself. Sure, the dealer will benefit for a while. He will make money himself, for a while, but in the end he will lose. The fishermen may catch more fish, and prosper for a while, but in the end he will lose. Why? In Massachusetts they were catching only half a million pounds of lobsters. They were discouraged, and in some way,—I do not know how,—they got the Massachusetts legislature to change the law so it would read down to nine, from 10 1-2. Immediately the catch went up to 1,200,000 pounds. There it stayed a year or two. Doubtless the dealer and the fisherman were happy then; but what began to happen? The decline set in. In less than five years they were back where they started from before they started to find fault. It went lower and lower, and if it had kept up it would have gone still lower.

It so happens that we have got to depend on the lobster for reproduction and the salvation of his own kind. Rhode Island has made real efforts toward the artificial propagation of the lobster, but if you would make a study of that thing and see the circumstances involved and the mortality rate they have because they must dispose of the lobster as soon as he has come to

the age, and must be put in the water subject to being caught by anything that swims, you will agree that artificial propagation has not proven successful.

The lobster law change in the state which has been suggested here this morning will result in close time for lobster fishermen in Maine, and ask them if they want close time. There has already been opportunity for close time. In just another moment I will be through.

The dealer—is this his bill? Is he joining hands with the dissatisfied fisherman? There is a bill before the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries requesting our approval, which points out that if he doesn't get this law, they will have to take the larger fish, open them up, take out the meat and sell it. That is a dealer's bill. We never did it before in this State. Another bill, asking approval,—is it a dealers' bill?—permitting him to bring lobsters from Nova Scotia and Canadian waters to our own towns? Is it a Maine fishermen's bill? No. They tried to take a survey and they tried to make a questionnaire out of this. They did, but unfortunately either the Commissioner or somebody got the thing balled up because I have heard fisherman after fisherman say there was nothing they could do with it except throw it away or destroy it. Why? Because it was not sufficiently clear as to the type of answer expected of him.

Anyway, we sometimes fail to pass a law because there is no demand for it. Here is a demand. 166 are fishing in the waters of York County today. Perhaps an equal number in Cumberland County wants a change. But that is the demand. Add it up and compare it with the total of 2770 fishermen, or in 1929 over 5000 fishermen, and see if it works out.

Gentlemen of the Senate, this is a dissatisfied lobster fishermen's bill, a dealers' bill, and it will do irreparable damage to the lobster industry of the State. We can take the situation as it is and struggle along as it is, now that none of us are making any money, and perhaps some of us are going into the red ink, but if we have the courage to face the situation the way we have been invited by the President to face the banking situation, there can be no question but what the dealers will come out all right, the

fishermen will live through it, and the lobster industry will be saved for the state.

Mr. McLOON of Knox: Mr. President, I cannot disagree with most that has been said. In fact, much which the Senator from Hancock (Senator Blasidell) has said is in favor of the amendment I propose to introduce, if allowed. He says the industry is in a deplorable condition. It is when nearly half of the fishermen in the State of Maine are forced out of business in two years. He thinks there is no call from fishermen for a change. We had a meeting not before the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries, but before the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, of fishermen and dealers,—that is, what fishermen could afford to come here,—to see if they could not agree on some bill. It seemed impossible for them to agree on anything and the meeting ended. The next day the Commissioner, who was in doubt in his own mind in regard to the feelings of the fishermen, sent out a questionnaire, asking those who favored a nine-inch law to so indicate, and those who favored the present law, and those who favored a double gauge law. There were no arguments about it one way or another. The returns came back from those licensed under the Sea and Shore Fisheries Commission, 1166 favored the change in law to 1068 who favored the present law—a majority of about 100 in favor of a change.

Now some of the dealers and fishermen thought the matter had not been explained to the fishermen in a proper way, and they sent out petitions explaining the advantage of the nine-inch law and on those petitions they received 1315 names, so there are a great number who are dissatisfied with the present law.

When this bill came into the House yesterday, it failed of passage by a narrow margin of seven votes. I cannot say I was entirely dissatisfied with that vote because for more than 30 years I had opposed a nine-inch lobster law. I entered the Senate this year to support the bill on account of the emergency that exists. The dealers are in a bad way, and cannot compete with dealers in other states who have a different law. They cannot make shipments of the kind of lobsters desired by their customers.

The dealer gets a letter ordering some chicken lobster and has to write back, saying the laws of the state do not permit him to ship chicken lobsters. The customer is dissatisfied and disappointed and orders where he can get them. He not only orders chicken lobster from Massachusetts, but also the large lobsters from there. The business goes away from the State of Maine. I know that to be a fact because in 1915 I decided we never would have a law which would permit the shipping of chicken lobsters and I established a branch in Massachusetts. Of course, at the time I had no trade in Massachusetts. I have seen our trade increase in Massachusetts and gradually grow until it is larger than our Maine trade, and at the time I established the branch in Massachusetts I had a very large Maine trade.

The interests of the fishermen and dealers are identical. The dealers have to depend upon the fishermen and they prosper in the same proportion the fishermen do. I feel that this year in the emergency that exists that perhaps we should go down to the level of the other states, and once on that level it might be possible to get a national law that would be a conservation law and would be a benefit to the whole industry. I had in mind a year ago there was a bill introduced into Congress which was a sort of embargo bill, based on the Maine law, that no lobsters could be transported from one state to the other,—a sort of interstate transportation law,—and no lobster could be imported from Canada that did not conform to the Maine law. The idea was that it would keep the chicken lobster in Canada from coming to the States and it would keep lobsters of less than chicken size—from seven to nine inches—with which the western states are being flooded.

There are no laws in the United States except in the coast states of Maine to New Jersey that pertain to the size of a lobster, and these short lobsters—"shack lobsters" as they call them in Canada, were imported to western states and taking the place of lobsters of Maine, Massachusetts and other states. Now, that law was opposed by the dealers in Massachusetts who had a trade on chicken lobsters, and the dealers in New York.

At the time we tried to broaden our Maine law, our conservation law, it was ridiculed by our opponents. They said, 'If you want a real conservation law, pass a double gauge law, and we will be with you on that'. And while I do not go to the level of the other states, when we are all on the same basis they could all work for the good of the lobster industry of the United States. The greatest factor in the failure of the passage of this law in the House was lack of conservation. While I contend the present law is not a conservation law because in this State at least, we see very few lobsters of less than 11 or 10 3-4 inches which are seed lobsters. The lobsters which we sell to the State, the seed lobsters, will average two and a half to three pounds, showing they are all potential breeders.

Our present law has no value as to conservation, and a nine-inch law I admit would be a step downward because there would be a longer time in which the lobster could be caught before becoming of breeding size, so I am not entirely disappointed that the bill failed of passage, but what I propose, if I am allowed, is to introduce an amendment which is a compromise measure, which has all the virtues of protection, and is recommended by all scientists who have made a study of the lobster, and is advocated by our own Sea and Shore Fisheries Commission, and believed in by the Massachusetts Commissioner, and also advocated by the commissioners of the United States, and I think it is no more than fair that the amendment should be offered, that we may debate the merits of it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD of York: Mr. President, I do not care to say much in regard to this lobster law, but there is one thing I noticed in Senator Blaisdell's argument that I didn't particularly like. He called York County bootleggers. It doesn't seem fair to me. But there is no one, I think, in this Senate that realizes what the trouble is in York County. He talks about his own county and I will talk about my county. You know, for years and years,—I will take it back to 1919, or 40 years before that, they have been buying seed lobsters. We raise money here every year and buy seed lobsters for the Commissioner. I think I am right. I know

very well I am right, and I know more than that,—that there hasn't been one of them put into York County waters for more than 50 years. How do you expect us to gain on lobsters with nothing put in to propagate our lobsters? There is Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and the law is loose, and they come down and catch our lobsters because it is legal. They come down and catch them and we cannot say that they cannot have them.

I really think it is wrong to take two or three counties and say that they must die dead. That is what it means to our business, to keep someone else partially alive. He says they have died now to the extent of fifty percent. He says there were 5000, but now only 2700. There is something wrong about it. He tells how to double it. Canada ships nine inch lobsters all the time. They have so many they have been to Washington to make a law that they shall not put them in here. It is a fact there are bills he speaks of in the committee. I do not know how it will affect us. We did offer three ways to the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries and he told us he thought it would be the way to do it. We offered this double gauge law and the Commissioner comes in and wants a new trap built that will not catch small lobsters. We offered to do that and try it two years and then if it was wrong to change it, but no, they would not do a thing but sit still.

I think times have changed, and they certainly have changed when they will allow automobiles on the island of Islesboro according to the vote of yesterday. I hope this Senate will vote to allow the amendment to be placed on this bill, and get at it fair, and see if we cannot do something to help the fishermen of York and Cumberland counties.

Mr. HARMON of Hancock: Mr. President, my say will be very brief. It is along the line of the welfare of the fishermen of the State of Maine, the lobster fishermen. These are very serious times and legislation which vitally affects the homes of from four to five thousand people living along the coast line of the State of Maine is serious legislation. There is no question, according to the records which have been returned from the fishermen themselves, that the fishermen themselves are the producers and the backbone of the industry because

without the fishermen there would be no dealers, neither could there be any lobsters served in the hotels. These fishermen who are dependent upon this industry have homes on the outlying islands and along our coast. They are wholly dependent on that one industry. If anything is passed in this Legislature to disturb or destroy that industry you are disturbing and eventually, I believe, if this nine inch lobster law is adopted, practically destroying the homes of these fishermen who depend wholly upon the lobster industry because they have their backs to the wall and they have nothing else to which they may turn for a livelihood and the families that are maintained by the lobster industry must abandon their homes if the lobster industry is weakened or destroyed. They have nothing else to look to.

Now, according to the returns of the questionnaires that were sent out less than 30% of the lobster fishermen are asking for a change in the law. More than 70% of the lobster fishermen show a desire to retain the present 10½ inch law. And these people who have worked at this livelihood all their lives and for generations before them, know what they want. Take the County of Washington with over 700 fishermen. According to the report, out of that 700 fishermen there are only 143 asking for a change in the law, according to the replies returned, and 250 in favor of the present law and I will say the balance of that more than 700 fishermen who did not reply must be in favor of the present law or otherwise they would have sent in replies.

Now, many of these fishermen along our coast line and on the outlying islands are a long distance from a post office and do not have much change to get postage stamps or to send their replies in. I wish there was something more that I could say along these lines but I do think the homes of these five thousand fishermen, should you adopt the nine inch law, within five or six years will have to be to a great extent abandoned. The lobster industry is the only means of livelihood they have and I hope you will vote to retain the present law.

Mr. PAGE of Somerset: Mr. President, I would like to support the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator McLoon. While I am not from a lobster county I be-

lieve that the State of Maine has got to protect its lobster industry and I believe that the double-gauge law or method is the only sound way to do it and I think that is the amendment that is to be offered.

Mr. BISSETT of Cumberland: Mr. President, for a point of information I would like to ask a question of the Senator from York, Senator Littlefield.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Bissett, wishes to ask a question of the Senator from York, Senator Littlefield. The Senator from Cumberland (Senator Bissett) may ask his question and the Senator from York, Senator Littlefield, may answer if he desires.

Mr. BISSETT: I would like to inquire of the Senator from York, Senator Littlefield, whether a hearing was held on this proposed double-gauge law.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Does the Senator mean at this session of the Legislature?

Mr. BISSETT: Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: I will say that there has been no hearing. But I believe that the questionnaire referred to mentioned the double-gauge law. I hold in my hand a card which I understand was sent out to the fishermen, and on that card it says, "Register your choice on the following question: 'I am in favor of the present law' (square) 'I am in favor of the nine inch law' (square) 'I am in favor of the double-gauge nine to fourteen inch law' (square) 'Signed'." That was a card that I picked up somewhere or that was laid on my desk. I don't remember how I got it but it is here anyway.

Mr. BISSETT: Has the Senator any record of how many voted for the double-gauge law on the questionnaire?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD: I have not.

Mr. BISSETT: I thank the Senator.

Mr. McLOON: Mr. President, I have no wish to disturb or destroy the lobster industry because I depend upon it for a living, and I have no wish to destroy the fishermen. I have not talked on the amendment because I thought I could probably talk on it after it had been introduced and I asked that we accept the majority report in order that the amendment might be introduced.

Mr. McDONALD of Washington:

Mr. President and members of the Senate, I feel that I would not be doing my duty to the fishermen of Washington County if I did not say just a word in expressing what I believe to be their sentiments upon this important matter.

As you have heard, we have a large percentage of our people in Washington County living along the shore who get their living from the lobster industry. It is a fact that they have suffered considerable by depression and it has produced the condition of hysteria among those people of which the President of this Senate has spoken to us this morning in speaking of the banking law. I firmly believe that a small percentage of those fishermen for a time believed that their best interests were in a change in the law in favor of the nine inch law. When I first came to this Legislature I had letters from quite a few of the people down there engaged in the lobster industry rather favoring the nine inch law, but as the matter became agitated before this Legislature and both sides of the question were presented here I think that many of them changed their minds, which of course they had a right to do, but I think that today the vast majority of the fishermen of Washington County are in favor of the retention of the present law. I thank you.

Mr. McLOON: Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Washington County (Senator McDonald) I will say that of those who have indicated what they desire, 250 desire the present law and 224 have asked for a change.

Now, this is not a proposition of the eastern and western parts of the State opposing one another. There are men who desire the change all over the State. I do not want to oppose a law that is going to destroy the lobster industry or that is going to be against conservation, what I want is a law that will be for greater conservation, a law that will restock the waters of the State of Maine.

Mr. BLAISDELL: Mr. President, I will not bore the Senate but just a moment, but I think I have here some figures that might answer some of the questions which have been asked. So far as our records go the total number of fishermen who voted that we should have a double-gauge law in this State was 146. York County, out of 166 fishermen to whom licenses have

been issued to this year, have 10 who say that they want to have the double-gauge law. Cumberland County, with 166 licensed fishermen, has 23 men who said that they wanted the double-gauge law. Sagadahoc has 11 who wanted the double-gauge law. Lincoln County has 14 who wanted the double-gauge law. Knox County has 10 who wanted the double-gauge law. Hancock County has 18 and Washington County has 16 who wanted that law.

My opposition to the presentation of the idea of the double-gauge law here at this session and at this time is that it is entirely a new bill, offered in the form of an amendment I will admit, but a new bill. The fishermen are not aware that the question of the double-gauge is to be raised here and possibly finally dealt with. If we are going to deal with the double-gauge the bill should be introduced as this one was introduced and the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries allowed to say which one they will recommend. There is a possibility of a change of gear. I oppose the suggestion of a new amendment which is so completely revolutionary to the one originally introduced.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Knox, Senator McLoon, is asking for the recognition of the Chair. The Chair will have to rule that the Senator from Knox (Senator McLoon), having spoken upon this matter three times, may not speak upon it again without the permission of the Senate. The Chair will ask the Senate if it will grant permission to the Senator from Knox, Senator McLoon, to speak again, and the Chair will assume, unless there is objection, that consent is granted. Hearing no objection, consent is granted.

Mr. McLOON: Mr. President, I will take up the attention of the Senate but for just a moment longer. In regard to the vote on the double-gauge law I will admit that it was not a large vote but a great many of those who favor a change in the law, if they cannot have the nine inch law would be in favor of the double-gauge law as a second choice and the second choice of a great many of those who prepared the present law would be for a double-gauge law.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Knox, Senator McLoon, that the majority report

of the committee "ought to pass" be accepted.

A viva voce vote being had,

The Chair was in doubt.

A division of the Senate was had. Thirteen having voted in the affirmative and sixteen opposed the motion to accept the majority report of the committee "ought to pass" did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock, the minority report of the committee "ought not to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

From the House:

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to the tenure of office of the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department of the City of Portland" (H. P. 863, L. D. 381) reported that the same ought not to pass.

In the House recommitted to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock, tabled pending recommitment in concurrence, and especially assigned for next Monday, March 13th.

From the House, the following order:

Ordered, the Senate concurring, that H. P. 693, L. D. 362, Bill "An Act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing" be recalled to the House from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game. (H. P. 1152)

In the House, read and passed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Angell of York, tabled pending passage in concurrence.

Bills in First Reading

An Act relating to a road in the town of Mariaville. (S. P. 125, L. D. 864)

An Act to amend Sections 48 to 51 inclusive of Chapter 28 of the Revised Statutes. (S. P. 358, L. D. 862)

An Act enabling cities and towns to take advantage of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans for construction of water works. (S. P. 570, L. D. 860)

An Act relating to the Back Bay Sanctuary in the city of Portland. (S. P. 573, L. D. 861)

(On motion by Mr. Schnurle of Cumberland, tabled pending assignment for second reading.)

An Act to reduce salaries of members and certain officers of Legislature. (S. P. 574, L. D. 865)

An Act to reduce salaries of county attorneys. (S. P. 575, L. D. 863)

An Act reducing the compensation of state officials and employees. (S. P. 576, L. D. 866)

Reports of Committees

Mr. Kitchen from the Committee on Claims on "Resolve in favor of the town of Holden" (S. P. 141) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in favor of George E. Widdoes" (S. P. 203) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The same Senator from the same Committee on "Resolve in favor of Charles Eugene Tefft" (S. P. 38) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Jackson from the Committee on Education on "Resolve in favor of a state pension for Mrs. Alida Poland of Round Pond" (S. P. 238) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. McDonald from the Committee on Insane Hospitals on Bill "An Act relating to admittance of insane patients to hospitals for temporary care" (S. P. 316, L. D. 524) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Blaisdell from the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to registration number plates" (S. P. 335, L. D. 683) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Weatherbee from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act relating to connections made by water utilities between street mains and abutting properties" (S. P. 339, L. D. 542) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Towle from the Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act relating to auxiliary state forests" (S. P. 343, L. D. 545) reported that the same ought not to pass as matter is covered by other legislation.

Which reports were read and accepted.

Send down for concurrence.

Mr. Schnurle from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to inland fish and game wardens; powers, duties and service of processes" (S. P. 193, L. D. 397) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which report was read and accepted, the bill read once and Tuesday next assigned for second reading.

Mr. Weeks from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act to revise the health and welfare laws" (S. P. 1, L. D. 1) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 577) and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Holmes from the same Committee on Bill "An Act relating to corporations and for the protection and development of forests" (S. P. 221) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 578) and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Weatherbee from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act relating to abandonment of property or discontinuance of service by Public Utilities" (S. P. 91, L. D. 103) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 579) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Pillsbury from the Committee on State Prison on Bill "An Act relative to the parole of prisoners" (S. P. 344, L. D. 505) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 580) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Bissett from the Committee on State School for Boys, State School for Girls and State Reformatories on Bill "An Act relating to commitment to and length of sentence at the Reformatory for Women" (S. P. 345, L. D. 506) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 581) and that it ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and accepted and the bills laid on the table for printing under joint rules.

Passed to be Engrossed

Resolve naming that portion of Township 3, Range 9, W. E. L. S. Piscataquis County, 5,960 acres donated to the State by Percival Proctor Baxter "Baxter State Park" (S. P. 46, L. D. 857).

An Act relating to the pay of those drafted to fight fires (S. P. 90, L. D. 855).

An Act to repeal the organization of the plantation of Chesuncook (S. P. 108, L. D. 854).

Resolve authorizing release of State's interest in certain lands. (S. P. 241, L. D. 856).

An Act to regulate the speed of motor vehicles (S. P. 357, L. D. 572).

An Act relating to weights and measures (S. P. 568, L. D. 859).

Resolve to reimburse the City of Bath for support and burial expenses of Mrs. William A. Griffin

formerly a resident of Malaga Island (S. P. 569, L. D. 858).

Resolve regulating fishing for pickerel in Oxford and York counties (H. P. 560, L. D. 144).

An Act to authorize the continuation of rules and regulations of the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game (H. P. 730, L. D. 337).

An Act regulating the use of out-board or inboard motors in Kennebec Stream in the county of Franklin (H. P. 1509, L. D. 819).

An Act validating the existing form of government of the City of Eastport (H. P. 1510, L. D. 818).

An Act imposing penalty for false representations made to the overseers of the poor and requiring information by treasurers of deposit companies (H. P. 1511, L. D. 820).

An Act relating to polling places in town of Sanford (H. P. 1512, L. D. 821).

An Act relating to stamping of registered boilers (H. P. 1514, L. D. 822).

Passed to be Enacted

An Act revising sundry sections of the Revised Statutes (S. P. 151, L. D. 212).

An Act relative to the visiting and setting of traps (S. P. 175, L. D. 665).

An Act relating to fur farms (S. P. 176, L. D. 668).

An Act relative to falsely assuming to be a game warden (S. P. 177, L. D. 667).

An Act relating to the West Bath Game Preserve (S. P. 190, L. D. 725).

An Act to authorize the Old Town Herbert Gray School District to refund any of its bonds falling due in the years 1933 and 1934 (S. P. 215, L. D. 717).

An Act relating to police pensions in the city of Portland (S. P. 233, L. D. 771).

An Act relating to partition of real estate (S. P. 327, L. D. 533).

An Act relating to autopsies on unclaimed bodies (S. P. 334, L. D. 540).

An Act relating to abolishment of grade crossings (S. P. 337, L. D. 541).

An Act relating to admission to normal schools (S. P. 440, L. D. 718).

An Act relating to sterilization in certain cases (H. P. 610, L. D. 241).

An Act authorizing the town of Bristol to raise money for the pur-

pose of helping keep in repair the cemeteries in said town (H. P. 638, L. D. 296).

An Act relating to prepayment of taxes (H. P. 662, L. D. 205).

An Act relative to licenses for dealers in deer skins and heads (H. P. 697, L. D. 308).

An Act relative to search and seizure for fish and game and equipment used in hunting, trapping and fishing (H. P. 712, L. D. 373).

An Act relative to night hunting. (H. P. 714, L. D. 324)

An Act relative to the taking of salmon in certain waters. (H. P. 716), L. D. 326)

An Act relative to the revocation of licenses after violation of the Fish and Game Laws. (H. P. 718, L. D. 307)

An Act prohibiting the use of partridge as bait for trapping. (H. P. 719, L. D. 328)

An Act relating to the penalties for violations of the Fish and Game Laws. (H. P. 722, L. D. 330)

An Act relative to the use of live decoys and boats in hunting waterfowl. (H. P. 724, L. D. 332)

An Act relating to ice fishing in Sandy Pond in Freedom and Montville, in the county of Waldo. (H. P. 731, L. D. 338)

An Act relative to non-residents kindling fires and employment of guides. (H. P. 732, L. D. 339)

An Act prohibiting the horning of deer. (H. P. 733, L. D. 340)

An Act relative to fees for trapping licenses, resident and non-resident. (H. P. 734, L. D. 403)

An Act relating to definitions under Fish and Game Laws. (H. P. 738, L. D. 407)

An Act relating to employers of labor. (H. P. 873, L. D. 311)

An Act to incorporate the Maine Reinsurance Company. (H. P. 977, L. D. 313)

An Act relative to speed of passenger busses. (H. P. 1047, L. D. 448)

An Act relating to tuition in secondary schools. (H. P. 1075, L. D. 458)

(On motion by Mr. Jackson of Cumberland, tabled pending enactment).

An Act relating to milk containers. (H. P. 1082, L. D. 558)

An Act relating to testing of live stock for tuberculosis. (H. P. 1085, L. D. 573)

An Act relating to protection at grade crossing. (H. P. 1149, L. D. 599)

An Act relative to the use of power boats in hunting waterfowl. (H. P. 1420, L. D. 732)

An Act to provide for the regulation of the practice of podiatry and for the examination and licensing of podiatrists. (H. P. 1467, L. D. 746)

(On motion by Mr. Weeks of Somerset, tabled pending enactment).

Finally Passed

Resolve authorizing payment of accident compensation to Leon P. Shepard. (S. P. 63, L. D. 731)

Resolve authorizing the Governor to convey certain land in Petersburg, Virginia, to the United States. (S. P. 163, L. D. 730)

Resolve providing for a survey of proposed game preserve in Hancock County. (S. P. 191, L. D. 722)

Resolve in favor of Fort Knox. (S. P. 433, L. D. 723)

Resolve relative to opening of Dole's Pond and Boyd's Pond in the town of Limington in the county of York (S. P. 447, L. D. 772)

Resolve opening Crystal Lake to ice fishing. (H. P. 553, L. D. 222)

Resolve relating to fishing in tributaries of Sturtevant Pond. (H. P. 564, L. D. 230)

Resolve in favor of Bernard Andrews of Canton, (H. P. 746, L. D. 412)

Resolve granting teacher's pension to Miss Nancy Rankin of Hiram. (H. P. 834, L. D. 749)

Resolve in favor of George Mawhinney of Jonesboro. (H. P. 1419, L. D. 742)

Resolve relating to fishing in Pleasant Pond in the town of Turner. (H. P. 1460, L. D. 752)

(Emergency Measure)

An Act to amend the banking laws by amending Section 91 of Chapter 57 of the Revised Statutes. (S. P. 548, L. D. 805)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 27 members of the Senate was passed to be enacted in concurrence.

Orders of the Day

The PRESIDENT: Under Orders of the Day, before taking up the special assignment, the Chair will advise that the order for adjournment comes back from the House amended to read as follows: "Ordered, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House ad-

journal they adjourn to meet Monday, March 13th at 8:30 o'clock in the evening."

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Weeks of Somerset, the Senate voted to recede and concur with the House in the passage of the order as amended.

The President laid before the Senate, House Report from the Committee on Legal Affairs, "Ought Not to Pass" on bill, "An Act providing for pensions for call firemen in Augusta" (H. P. 879, L. D. 315), tabled by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock, on March 9th pending commitment to the Committee on Pensions in concurrence and today assigned; and the Chair recognized that Senator.

Mr. BLAISDELL of Hancock: Mr. President, do I understand that that bill on the part of the House was referred to the Committee on Pensions?

The PRESIDENT: In the House the "ought not to pass" report was tabled on motion by the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Farris, pending acceptance of the report. Later on motion by the same gentleman it was committed to the Committee on Pensions.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Blaisdell of Hancock, the bill was committed to the Committee on Pensions in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Page of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Public Health on bill "An Act for the regulation of the practice of hairdressing and cosmetic therapy" (H. P. 1013, L. D. 421) (together with Remonstrance H. P. 1147) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1513, L. D. 823) under a new title "An Act for the regulation of the practice of hairdressing and beauty culture" and that it ought to pass, tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending acceptance of the report in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is the acceptance of the committee report "ought to pass" in concurrence. A division has been asked.

A division of the Senate was had, Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and five opposed the report was accepted.

Thereupon, the report of the committee, "Ought to pass," was accepted in concurrence, the bill was given its first reading and Monday, March 13th assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Angell of York, the Senate voted to take from the table, Joint Order (H. P. 1552), recalling to the House from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game bill, An Act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing (H. P. 693, L. D. 362), tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending passage in concurrence; and on further motion by the same Senator the order was passed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Angell of York, the Senate voted to take from the table, Joint Order (H. P. 1552) recalling to the House from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game bill, An Act closing Middle Range Pond to ice fishing (H. P. 693, L. D. 362), tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending passage in concurrence; and on further motion by the same Senator the order was passed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Weeks of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table, House Report from the Committee on Judiciary, "ought not to pass" on "An Act providing for removal of paupers to town of settlement" (H. P. 849, L. D. 261), tabled by that Senator on March 9th pending consideration.

Mr. WEEKS of Somerset: Mr. President. I now move that the Senate adhere to its former action.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Somerset, Senator Weeks, now moves that the Senate adhere. In the House the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary. In the Senate the report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence.

The motion to adhere prevailed.

On motion by Mr. Kitchen of Aroostook, out of order and under suspension of the rules, it was

Ordered, the House concurring, that there be recalled from the engrossing department Legislative Document 809, Resolve in favor of Daniel Mahar of Bangor, for the purpose of correcting an error in the wording of the resolve.

Sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: Is there anything further to come before the Senate this morning under Orders of the Day?

On motion by Mr. Holmes of Androscoggin,

Adjourned, until Monday evening, March 13th, at eight-thirty o'clock.