

the Bay to spawn. The Virginia committee said that they were willing to make such regulations as were recommended by the Government, but wanted to know if Maryland would protect the shad after they reached Maryland waters. Dr. Coker stated that there were some bad net conditions in Maryland, especially near the head of the Bay, in the vicinity of the Government fish hatchery. The Maryland representative assured the Virginia committee that if they permitted the fish to get up the Bay that they would be protected in Maryland waters.

It was decided, at 11 P. M., by mutual agreement, that concurrent laws to protect the fish should be taken up at another meeting. The Maryland representative extended an invitation, in the name of Maryland, for the new committee to come to Annapolis, in order that the two States might get together on concurrent fish laws during the 1916 session of the General Assembly of the respective States.

By request of the Speaker of the House of Delegates of Virginia, the Maryland representative addressed the House on January 19, on concurrent fishery legislation, as it was the desire of the Speaker to impress the up-State members of the importance of this legislation.

Respectfully yours,

SWEFSON EARLE,
Chief Engineer, Maryland Shell Fish Commission.

[Which was read and ordered spread upon the Journal.]

Mr. Cooper submitted the following:

CERTIFICATES OF THE STATE BUILDING AND IMPROVEMENT LOAN.

No. 1.....	\$81,200.00
No. 2.....	91,000.00
No. 3.....	15,000.00
No. 4.....	24,000.00
No. 5.....	88,800.00
No. 6.....	41,000.00
No. 7.....	35,000.00
No. 8.....	9,000.00
No. 9.....	15,000.00
No. 10.....	100,000.00
No. 11.....	33,000.00
No. 12.....	126,000.00
No. 13.....	99,150.00
No. 14.....	23,050.00
No. 15.....	23,050.00
No. 16.....	30,000.00
No. 17.....	88,800.00

\$923,050.00