

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-First Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE.

1903.

Orders of the Day.

The majority and minority reports of the committee on Ways and Bridges, on bill, to provide for ownership and maintenance of highway bridges, came up by special assignment, the pending question being upon the motion of Mr. Stetson of Penobscot to accept the minority report. On motion by Mr. Burleigh of Aroostook, said reports were re-assigned for Wednesday of next week.

On motion by Mr. Dudley of Aroostook, bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Easkahegan Dam Company was taken from the table the pending question being on first reading. The bill took its first reading, and on motion of Mr. Wilson of Washington, the rules were suspended and the bill took its second reading, and was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Burns of Cumberland moved to reconsider the vote whereby upon the Resolve in favor of Fort William Henry at Pemaquid, the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported ought not to pass; and on further motion of the same senator, said motion was laid on the table until tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Wilson of Washington, the Senate adjourned to meet on Thursday, March 5, 1903, at ten o'clock A. M.

HOUSE.

Wednesday March 4, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Livingston of Augusta.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

The order, passed in the House yesterday, extending the time for the reception of petitions and bills for private and special legislation until March 11th, came from the Senate amended by making the time March 6th.

On motion of Mr. Weeks of Fairfield, the House recessed and concurred with the Senate.

Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Sebasticook Manufacturing and Power Company, which was passed to be engrossed in the House, came from the Senate recommitted to the committee on legal affairs.

On motion of Mr. Curtis of Portland the vote was reconsidered whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed, and on further motion by the same gentleman it was recommitted to the committee on legal affairs in concurrence with the Senate.

Bill, An Act to regulate the placing of permanent moorings in harbors, which was passed to be enacted in the House, came from the Senate recommitted to the committee on legal affairs.

On motion of Mr. Allen of Sanford, the note was reconsidered whereby, this bill was passed to be enacted, and on motion of Mr. Watson of Chelsea the vote was reconsidered whereby, it was passed to be engrossed, and the bill was then recommitted to the committee on legal affairs in concurrence with the Senate.

The report of the committee on the judiciary, reporting ought not to pass on bill, An Act to supply towns and cities with pure water, came from the Senate with the report recommitted to the judiciary committee.

On motion of Mr. Weeks of Fairfield, the report was recommitted to the judiciary committee in concurrence with the Senate.

The report of the Committee on Taxation, reporting ought not to pass on Bill, An Act to tax railroads according to their cash value, came from the

Senate recommitted to the Committee on Taxation.

On motion of Mr. Thompson of China, the report was recommitted to the Committee on Taxation in concurrence with the Senate.

The majority and minority reports of the Committee on Education on Resolve in favor of Colby College, came from the Senate with the majority report, ought to pass, accepted and the resolve referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

On motion of Mr. Drew of Portland, the House concurred with the Senate in the adoption of the report, and the bill was then referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs in concurrence.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

An Act to provide blank books and stationery for the Dover Municipal Court.

Resolve to provide means for examination of claims for State pensions.

An Act to amend Chapter 227 of the Private and Special Laws of 880, entitled "An Act to supply the people of Houlton with pure water."

An Act to amend the charter of the city of Auburn, and to provide a board of public works.

An Act to amend Chapter 285 of the Public Laws of 1901, entitled "An Act providing for State roads and for the improvement thereof."

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Judiciary, reported in a new draft and ought to pass Bill, An Act to amend the charter of the Sanford Light and Water Company, and to consolidate the Springvale Aqueduct Company and the Butler Spring Water Company.

Mr. Weeks from the same committee on Bill, An Act to extend the charter of the Strong Water Company, reported ought to pass.

Same gentleman from same committee, reported in a new draft and ought to pass Bill, An Act to regulate the practice of embalming and the transportation of dead bodies of persons who have died of infectious diseases.

Mr. Ross from the Committee on Interior Waters on Bill, An Act to incorporate the Libby Meadow Brook Dam Company, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Smith from the Committee on Interior Waters, reported in a new draft and ought to pass, Bill, An Act to incorporate the Round Pond Improvement Company.

Mr. Todd from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill, An Act to regulate the taking of fish in Frenchmen's Bay, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Greenleaf from the same committee, on petitions of Otto B. Marston and others of Eastport and Lubec, praying for change in the laws relating to lobster fishing, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Eaton from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on resolve in favor of the Maine General hospital, reported that same be re-committed to the Committee on Public Charities and State Beneficiaries.

Mr. Sewall from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the St. Elizabeth's Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum, reported that same be re-committed to the Committee on Public Charities and State Beneficiaries.

Mr. Dudley from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the Eastern Maine General hospital, reported that same be re-committed to the Committee on Public Charities and State Beneficiaries.

Mr. Bodwell from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the Bangor Children's Home, reported that same be re-committed to the Committee on Public Charities and State Beneficiaries.

Mr. Swett from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the Home for Friendless Boys, reported that same be re-committed to the Committee on Public Charities and State Beneficiaries.

Mr. Pettengill from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the Society of the Sisters of Charity for the use of the Healy Asylum of Lewiston, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Page from the same committee, on resolve in favor of the Young Wo-

men's Home of Lewiston, reported ought to pass.

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

Bills on First Reading.

An Act to authorize the town of Kennebunk to own and maintain an electric lighting and power plant.

On motion of Mr. Nash of Kennebunk the rules were suspended, the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

Passed to be Engrossed.

An Act to amend Chapter 61, Public Laws of 1887, relating to Loan and Building Associations.

An Act to incorporate the Meduxnekeag Light and Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Houlton and Woodstock Electric Railroad Company.

An Act to incorporate the Millinocket Trust Company.

An Act to incorporate the Security Trust Company.

An Act to incorporate the Maine Midland Railroad Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brunswick and Topsham Water District.

An Act to establish a municipal court in the city of Eastport.

On motion of Mr. Pike of Lubec this bill was tabled and Thursday, March 12, was assigned for its consideration.

An Act to incorporate the Kennebec Valley Railroad Company.

An Act to enable the Presque Isle Water Company to issue bonds to pay, retire and cancel its outstanding bonds.

An Act to amend the charter of the president and trustees of Colby College.

An Act to amend the charter of the Portland and Cape Elizabeth Ferry Company.

An Act to amend Chapter 194 of the Public Laws of 1901 entitled "An Act additional to Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes relating to bowling alleys."

An Act for the better protection of deer in the county of York.

An Act to provide in part for the expenditures of government for the year 1903.

An Act establishing the salary of the county attorney for the County of York.

An Act relating to the office of county commissioner.

An Act to amend Chapter 175 of the Private and Special Laws of 1887, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Androscoggin Valley Agricultural Society.

An Act to consolidate and amend Chapter 177 of the Special Laws of 1887, and all acts additional thereto and amendatory thereof, relating to the Old Town municipal court.

Resolves authorizing a temporary loan for the year 1903.

Resolves authorizing a temporary loan for the year 1904.

Resolve making appropriations for the Passamaquoddy tribe of Indians.

Resolve to provide for the expenses of the Maine Industrial School for Girls.

Resolve in favor of roads in the Indian Township, Washington county.

Resolve making appropriation for the Penobscot tribe of Indians.

Resolve in favor of establishing a fish hatchery and feeding station at the Rangeley Lakes.

An Act to cede jurisdiction of the State of Maine to the United States of America over so much land as has been or may be hereafter acquired for the public purposes of the United States.

Bill, An Act to relieve the town of Boothbay Harbor from the duty of building, repairing or maintaining roads, streets or ways in the Isle of Springs.

An Act to amend Chapter 130 of the Private and Special Laws of 1886, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Sebec Dam Company, as amended by Section 6 of Chapter 26 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899."

An Act to amend the charter of the Bar Harbor Banking and Trust Company. (Tabled pending its third reading on motion of Mr. Dudley of Augusta).

Passed to be Enacted.

An Act to incorporate the Merrill Trust Company.

Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Potter of Brunswick, Bill, An Act providing for a license for non-residents to hunt moose and deer, was taken from the table.

The question being on the adoption of House amendment A, by inserting between the word "shall" and "guide" in the sixth line of Section three, the word 'knowingly.'

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

On motion by Mr. Weeks of Fairfield, the vote was reconsidered whereby the House concurred with the Senate in its amendment to the order extending the time for the reception of petitions and bills for private and special legislation, and on further motion by the same gentleman the order was indefinitely postponed.

Resubmission.

Special assignment: Motion to substitute minority for majority report of Committee on Temperance, reporting "ought not to pass" and "ought to pass" on resolve for an amendment to the constitution by abrogating and annulling amendment five, relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. KELLEY of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker, For the second time it is my privilege to address a Maine Legislature and give expression to my opinions upon the important questions brought to our attention by the resolution now under consideration.

Two years ago those who asserted their right to express themselves as supporting the resolution for resubmission, were classed, in some quarters, as rummies and saloon supporters.

Conditions have changed since then, and all people, with the possible exception of those who have a lien claim on a mansion in the sky, are willing to allow that the resubmissionist has a right to his opinion, and a right to express that opinion in public, and in the Legislature of the State of Maine.

We can consider this feeling as evidence, that the people of this State are making progress, are becoming enlightened upon the temperance question, and that they are beginning to realize the truth of the statement, that constitutional State prohibition does not always mean temperance.

There are some people in this State, however, who cannot understand why

it is that every man cannot subscribe to the doctrine of State prohibition. I am willing to recognize the right of any individual to differ with me upon this or any other question, but I cannot resist the opportunity to criticize those who consider themselves holy at all times, and who cannot, in their bigoted vision, see any good quality in others.

I can see in such people, those who worship a false God, some of them for salary, and others for effect.

Despite the criticism, the insult and abuse we have persevered, and today again appear to give our support to those principles which are right, which are just, and which will one day be adopted in this State.

The flag of resubmission is planted upon a rock as firm and secure as the everlasting hills; it will withstand the shock of temporary failure, will resist the gales of nonsense and hatred which attempt to destroy it, and will sooner or later, by virtue of its own reasonableness, its own strength, its own justice, cause the best blood of Maine to rally around it and carry it to victory in this our grand and beautiful commonwealth.

I favor resubmission as a temperance man, as a total abstainer from all intoxicating liquor, as a believer in temperance work, and as one who has in the past, and who is willing in the future to do his part in spreading the doctrine of total abstinence everywhere.

I yield to no man or woman in my loyalty to the cause of total abstinence, but I cannot believe that the state prohibitory law is a benefit to the cause. On the contrary I believe it is a hindrance to the progress of temperance work, for it prescribes unreasonable restrictions and taken as a whole, is a law which does not command the respect and support of reasonable men.

There is no question confronting the people of the world today of greater importance than the question of intemperance; in an economic sense it is greater than all other economic questions; in a political sense it is the very source from which springs nearly all the corruption and rottenness which mars the politics of our day.

In a moral sense, it is the great curse that drags down the exalted from their high place, that destroys the happiness of home, the love of kindred, that blights the hope of ambition, that fills the prison cells, that furnishes the victims for the gallows and the chair.

There are some people who will use the old style temperance speech calling attention to the horrors that follow the use of intoxicating liquor, as an argument against resubmission.

But is there any man with a grain of common sense who will dare to say that this argument will not apply to the liquor traffic in the State of Maine under constitutional State prohibition, as well as it applies to the conditions in other states under the local prohibition law?

What folly and nonsense after the experience of over fifty years with the annual crop of drunkards increasing and the higher felonies including murders growing more numerous with each passing year.

A speaker on the floor of this House two years ago said, "Looking across the river from this Capitol we see the Maine Insane hospital. Many of those who are there, it is said fifty per cent., are there on account of liquor, directly or indirectly. The people are calling for large appropriations for the same at Bangor and we must grant them. Do you suppose this institution across the river would not have been sufficient for this State and its weak ones for generations only for this liquor curse? But rum is here, you say (and we know it to our sorrow). So is murder, and would you legalize murder and other crimes?"

The same gentleman further said, "Then let us do all we can to remove this blighting curse by voting against resubmission and against the petitions on which names appear of nearly every rumseller in Maine. Vote to re-submit today, and in 48 hours Maine will be flooded with rum, and temperance weakened for years. Vote no resubmission and enforce the law and 300 rum shops will go out of business in one week's time it is estimated."

These are the exact words of the gentleman and I present them to you

as a fair sample of the character of the arguments against resubmission.

What a splendid commentary upon that great agency for temperance, the State prohibitory law. So well does it serve its purpose that this enormous expenditure of money was necessary to provide for the poor unfortunates who fell victims to the rum curse in this imperial prohibitory State of ours. If it continues much longer to render such effective service we will have to construct a new insane hospital at Kittery so as to provide sufficient accommodations for the new crop.

And he also informs us with great wisdom and assurance that 300 rum shops will go out of business in one week, according to the estimate, if we enforce the law.

Now as to this proposition I can only say that the gentleman's experience was confined strictly to local conditions in the community in which he lived, which might have been the terminus of the last newly made turnpike. He certainly could not have referred to the cities of our State, for the experience in those places has demonstrated in the past, and it is being demonstrated, today, that enforcement of the law only succeeds in creating a lower class of rumshops, commonly known as kitchen dives.

As to his assertion that those who vote against resubmission will do a great service to the cause of State prohibition, there is hardly need of comment. It is the assertion of the man, and there are many like him who have not taken that broad view of the temperance question which its growing importance deserves. Such men have lived too much in themselves, they forget that there is a great world beyond them, and that the laws which govern mankind must take man as he is, not as the gentle lamb they would have him to be. You can never make man good by law. You can never force from that unwilling being a complete surrender to the unreasonable. The State prohibitory law is fit to govern the angels in Heaven, for they are a law unto themselves, but it never has and never will compel the respect of the average man.

As Archbishop Ireland truthfully says, "unfortunately it is a condition

and not a theory that confronts us, and it behooves us to meet it like sensible men. It should be borne in mind that it is impossible to force men to high ideals."

Take this proposition home to yourself each and every one of you; and in your quiet conscience which should be the guide of your conduct, ask yourselves if this is not right.

And the gentleman further referred to that musty old argument that died, was buried, and was resurrected, that if you should legalize the sale of intoxicating liquor, you should also legalize murder and other crimes.

I have no doubt but there are some here who will oppose resubmission and will use the same argument. It is a stock argument. It was used by the first State Prohibitionist and it has been handed down as an heirloom to all the family of State Prohibitionists since his time.

Let us consider this argument as it it used in favor of State Prohibition and against resubmission. There is no better way to ascertain the wisdom or efficacy of a law, than to consider its history from its beginning, its successes and its failures.

The history of the prohibitory law is only to well known. It is a history that brings the blush of shame to the cheek of every man who loves this State. That it has not been a success as a temperance measure is conceded by all fair minded and impartial men.

Its failures are so numerous that I cannot take your time to enumerate them.

Every law has a definite purpose. The laws against murder and larceny, provided penalties for the commission of these offenses with a view to prevent their commission and to punish the offender. These crimes are such as would naturally be considered criminal, regardless of statute law; for every man has a right to be protected in his person and his property against a trespasser. By the 10 commandments the Lord himself pronounced their just punishment.

The cry of "stop thief" in the street, will cause men to neglect their present business and hasten to assist in his capture. The crime of murder will

cause in the community in which it is committed a general feeling of anger and indignation, and sometimes threats of lynching, without awaiting the action of the courts; thus showing in every possible way that the public have no respect for the murderer, the thief, the assaulter, and that at all times they are willing by active, real, live sentiment to aid in their prosecution.

Do you find such a sentiment in favor of the State prohibitory law? Do you find many men who will ever pause as they walk in the streets of our cities and larger towns, to witness, much less prevent, a violation of this law which occupies a place in our sacred constitution?

How many men in their hearts believe that the fairly respectable rum-seller is a real criminal? How many of you here would refuse to greet and associate with your hotel keeper, yet he is or he has been a criminal. He is violating, or he has violated, the constitutional law of the State. You would not do that to the thief or the murderer, and yet according to some people there is no man on top of the earth that is more degraded than the rum-seller.

When I hear this argument, I call the attention of those who use it, and it is a vital point in the discussion of this question; I ask them to point out a part of the constitution of Maine that is violated with such regularity as this part of it, or a part of it that is violated at all. I dare say it will be a most difficult undertaking for any of them to find the spot. I ask you all candidly and fairly, why is it there? What good does it do? Does it improve the character of the instrument? Does it serve any useful purpose? On the other hand, is it not a reflection upon the constitution and the State?

Twenty years ago by a mistake of the voters of Maine this law was elevated to a dignity which it has ever since disgraced.

I have heard this remark made by certain supporters of State prohibition: Why not submit the remainder of the constitution as well as this part of it? I answer that there is no other part of the constitution that gives us any cause for complaint. I maintain that from a legal and common sense stand-

point, it has no more right to a place in the constitution of Maine, that the law which protects the dearly beloved moose, in his wanderings through the woods.

Remember that this law is a part of the constitution of Maine; remember that the constitution is the organic law of the State, the very foundation of all our rights and privileges; remember all of these things the next time you make the suggestion that was made famous by the governor of North Carolina, or when you respond with the words, "I don't care if I do."

When this time comes always remember that you voted to keep the prohibitory amendment away from the people, and aided in keeping the poor innocent in its sacred cage.

Let us for a moment consider this law from the standpoint of common sense. Every member of this House will agree with me in this assertion, that laws, whether they deal with the property or the person, must be reasonable in order to obtain the active support of reasonable men.

Is the State prohibitory law a reasonable law? Does it present itself to practical and experienced men as a law that will ever receive that degree of support which is accorded the laws enacted to prevent and punish the commission of other crimes?

The experience of 50 years which we have had in this State to my mind answers the question in the negative. The amount of money received in fines throughout this State, and the number of persons paying these fines, and the regularity with which the same individual walks into court and pays his fine, year after year, demonstrate that what has been called prohibition has really been an irregular license system. The number of persons in this State who have made the liquor business the sole source of income are legion. This would not be possible if the law itself was supported or was considered a proper law by the people. The murderer or the thief does not meet with the same reception in society that is accorded the rumseller, and this is a proposition which I must respectfully refer to our brethren who would make the suggestion that we should legalize

the other crimes if we legalize the sale of intoxicating liquor. What is the effect of the enforcement of this law? What lesson does its enforcement teach?

There has never been a time in the history of the State of Maine, when the prohibitory law has been enforced to that degree that proves it to be a benefit to the cause of temperance. In theory it is sublime, in practice ridiculous.

When Sheriff Cram in Cumberland county during the first two years of his incumbency enforced that law, honestly and to the best of his ability, and in accordance with the solemn oath which he took upon entering into the performance of his duties, did he at the termination of the two years of somewhat successful enforcement, receive that reward for his honesty, his integrity and uprightness, which he so well deserved? No, he did not, but was re-elected to that office for a second time by such a narrow margin, and under such peculiar circumstances as to cause him to say that he considered the verdict of the people as being decidedly adverse to the rigid and impartial enforcement of the prohibitory law.

We have, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of this House an illustration more recent, but more pathetic.

At the midnight hour of January 1st., 1901, in the sheriff's office in Cumberland county, a man whose heart was large, whose brain was powerful, whose ability most remarkable, raised his right hand and took his oath that he would perform the duties of the office of sheriff of Cumberland county to the best of his ability, and in accordance with the law and constitution of the State of Maine. That man whose sincerity and honor has never been questioned entered upon his duties with a determination to extinguish completely the liquor traffic in Cumberland county. Although he realized in part the task which lay before him, he did not fully comprehend what a stupendous an undertaking he was about to assume.

That during the term of his office he performed his duties with all his heart and all his vigor in the work, everyone admits, yet he did not succeed in

proving that the prohibitory law reaches that great source of evil-intemperance. He did not convince any reasonable man that the prohibitory law reduces drunkenness to any notable extent, and gentlemen of this House that is the purpose of the law. His policy was defeated at the polls last September.

The corruption, dishonesty and laxity of officers sworn to enforce the law, which was manifest in the administration of the office in that county and in the other counties of the State prior to 1901 also wormed itself into the administration of Sheriff Pearson. A man in whom he had placed the most explicit confidence, confessed to the taking of bribes and was indicted in the court for the crime. Suspicion pointed to other officers of the administration, but to the credit of Mr. Pearson himself, no man can say that the finger of suspicion ever pointed to him.

But these circumstances bring home to us the difficulty of enforcing this law, when it lacks the supporting sentiment, the sympathy and the respect of the people. When the American Ice Company is doing business in Hades, then and not until then will the prohibitory law prohibit in the State of Maine. The selling of intoxicating liquor is a crime, only when so declared by statute. It is not a crime in itself, and for that reason you can never succeed in compelling the people to believe that liquor selling is the heinous offense which some enthusiasts would have us believe.

This feeling as regards the character of the offense has a natural tendency to make criminals of the officers sworn to enforce it. It does not take them long to ascertain that in spite of all intoxicating liquor, it will still be sold their efforts to suppress the traffic in and drank; and that men of the highest social standing will not assist them in their efforts to enforce the law, but will sometimes openly encourage the man who violates it.

When they realize this, they become less earnest in their efforts, and soon learn to follow the old and well worn path, made by their predecessors. They accept the offering of the rumseller, given to them for protection, without the slightest disturbance of conscience.

To my mind it was this disloyalty on the part of his trusted officers that caused the great and generous heart of Samuel F. Pearson to break down before the end of his term. It was this that caused the energy, with which he was so well endowed, to relax. It was this that hastened the coming of death, to that great and good man, whose honesty and nobility of character, whose splendid charity to the unfortunate poor, will ever live in the hearts and in the memories of the people of Maine.

Two years ago it was my pleasure to attend a meeting at Old Orchard which was advertised as "A Rousing Grand Temperance Mass Convention" under the leadership of Mr. Pearson, and the list of distinguished speakers contained about all of the individuals actively connected with the prohibitory movement in the State. The meetings, which were poorly attended, continued for four days. On the last evening Mr. Pearson announced that the expenses of the convention amounted to something like \$75 and that he lacked \$10 or \$12 of the amount necessary to pay the bills although he had taken a collection at each and every meeting.

This illustrates how difficult it is to awaken the people in support of this law and its enforcement. You seldom hear of a temperance meeting in the State of Main nowadays, and when you do see one, the vacant chairs are much more numerous than those which hold an occupant. The decline in active temperance work is very noticeable in every part of the State, and the reason for this condition is apparent. Instead of using moral suasion methods upon the individual, the temperance people are leaning on the prohibitory amendment to do the work, while the rumseller, who assisted them in amending the constitution, is growing fat on the profits of his business. There is, however, a shaft of light breaking through the clouds, for in this State there has just been organized a new temperance society known as the "Knights of Temperance," with moral suasion as its method of work, and I am certain that they will accomplish more for the cause of temperance than the entire combination or organizations, that devote the

greater part of their time to nursing the constitutional body.

I do not believe in State prohibition because it has proven a failure everywhere. There are but four states in the entire union in which the policy of state prohibition prevails. And in each one of these states we find a condition similar to ours. One of the states produced Carrie Nation, the saloon smasher, and when we read of her work in demolishing the gilded saloons in Kansas, do we wonder how it happens that the gilded saloon can exist in that prohibitory state, when we know the condition here.

Vermont, after years of trial, during which the law was enforced as it never has been enforced in this State, abolished the law and declared for the local prohibition plan, which is the method that is approved by all advanced students of the temperance question.

I believe in local prohibition because it establishes prohibition in each community if the people so desire. And that kind of prohibition is the most effective for it has behind it the support of the majority of the people of the community. It is not necessary for any city or town to have license unless they desire it, and if they do vote for license, I maintain that they will have a condition vastly superior to that which they now have. It is well known, that in this State, we have had a system of criminal regulation of the liquor traffic. The hours of opening and closing are recognized as a rule by the officers and the rumsellers. The Sunday rule of closing is recognized everywhere; and after the present spasm of enforcement has passed, and this Legislature has adjourned, we will see the same old rules once more applied, and the sale of liquor regulated, but not suppressed.

The revenue reports tell us that the retail liquor dealers are more numerous in Maine than in Massachusetts, and all students of this question will verify the assertion that there is much more, and much better prohibition in that state than we find in ours.

An investigation of the conditions in many of the Southern states demonstrates a similar condition, although our friends, the State prohibitionists

tell us that local prohibition means license and rum supremacy.

If you will but read the opinions of students upon the question of regulating the liquor traffic you will find that they are practically unanimous in condemning State prohibition as a means of regulation, while in nearly every instance they commend the local option or local prohibition idea. Among these students we find some of the most eminent men in our country.

In our own State we find that each year brings out strong and able gentlemen in favor of the local option plan. They come from the pulpit as well as from the ranks of professional business men, and assuredly they would not support any law that would be a detriment to the progress of our State.

Two years ago after my remarks in favor of resubmission were concluded, a speaker on the floor of this House, who has since been exalted to a chair in the parlor on my right, described my simple statement as a destructive criticism of the law.

Now, I presume that he meant that my remarks, or remarks of such a character, would have a tendency to destroy the prohibitory law in this State. My speech did not destroy the law; that is certain. But if it were possible to do so, I would put so much powder for destructive purposes into my remarks here, that it would blow the State prohibitory law to pieces and the last remnant of it, the fifth amendment to the constitution of Maine would be seen rapidly moving Heavenward to be tacked on to the constitution governing Paradise, where I believe its provision could be enforced.

And I believe that in doing this I would be performing a service for the cause of temperance and a service for the State of Maine.

To sum it all up we must conclude that State prohibition is a failure, that it corrupts not only the officers sworn to enforce it, but carries the corruption into our business and social life; that by the disregard of its provisions, so manifest in our State, it brings all other laws into contempt and puts a premium on perjury.

We must also conclude from the experience of the past few months that it will be necessary to add a depart-

ment of Sheriffology to the theological schools in Maine if we want to have sheriffs upon whom the people can depend. The office of sheriff has become the object of the parson's ambition.

Now what is the vital point in the proposition of resubmission?

What is the great question before the people of this State, today? What question is being discussed in every part of the commonwealth? It is the question as to whether or not we have the law which is best suited for government and control of the liquor traffic. I refer to this agitation which is going on all over this State, as the best argument, why we should have a resubmission of this question.

I hope there is no man here who is unwilling to abide by the judgment of the voters of the State expressed by majority. And that being the case, let us submit this question to the people, let us ascertain the will of the people, and let us when will is expressed, carry it into effect with all the power and force that lies within us.

There can be no valid or substantial reason why this question should not be submitted. It is a constitutional amendment which we are discussing, today. It is a part of the law of the people; it was created by the people, and the time has now come when we should again ask them if it is still the law which they desire.

Another thing which it is well to recall, and that is that the constitution provides that the question of the advisability of change, or amendment to the constitution of the State shall be first passed upon by the Legislature. The resolution must receive a vote of two-thirds of the voting members of the legislative bodies. It must then be submitted to the people in regular form, and they must upon their ballots express their approval or disapproval of the law by voting, yes or no. Remember that this is the people's law. It is not of legislative creation. The executive, the legislative and judicial departments have no power over it. But it is possible for the Legislature to prevent the people from having an opportunity to express themselves upon it. It is possible for personal am-

bitions and political hopes to worm themselves into the heart of the unwise legislator and cause him to vote to keep the question away from the people in order that these political hopes and political ambitions may be subserved.

That is possible, gentlemen of this House, but it is an most unwise policy. It is possible to try the temper of the people for a time, but you can rest assured that it will not last.

The storm will break in the old State of Maine, some day, and it will break with great force and fury, and some of those who have played with the people too long will experience what it is to be submerged under the ocean of the people's indignation.

Everywhere in Maine the cry goes up, "Give us this law that we may pass upon it." It is not confined to those who believe that the law is not a proper law; but joining in the chorus we find prohibitionists who opposed resubmission two years ago, also newspapers that were born in the prohibition cradle, and have grown to old age coddling and nursing this sweet untried infant.

So let this Legislature be not afraid to give this question to the people. It is their demand. It is their right to have that demand complied with.

Remember we are not here as representatives of our own personality. We are the servants of all the people.

Do not be deluded by the unwarranted statements and foolish nonsense that you will be classed as a rummy if you vote for this resolution. Such infantile chatter comes from the mouths of those who should have lived 200 years ago. Some of them find that kind of talk to be very profitable as it helps them to earn a salary.

By voting for this resolution you simply say: I am willing that this question shall be decided by those who have a right to make or unmake the constitution, and I will let the plain people decide it, and I have an abiding faith that they will decide it rightly.

The people can always be trusted, although we sometimes find men and women who feel themselves constituted and appointed as the guardians of the people, and who imagine that they and

they alone are the best judges as to the wants of the true sovereigns of the State.

They feel in this particular case that the 5th amendment to the constitution of Maine is their own sweet baby, and they talk of the expense of its submission, of the labor incident to a campaign, and of the thousand and one things it will be necessary for them to do for the dear thing when it is before the people for inspection.

What right have they to talk in this strain? What particular authority over this amendment have they that they should talk of expense and labor? This constitution belongs to the people. It is the people's property. It is that which the people own and control, and I hope and trust that this constitution which is the legitimate child of the great mother constitution, which was given birth in the blood of the soldiers and patriots of 1776, as the great charter of the people's rights and liberties, will never, never, never become the property of those self-constituted owners.

The darkness of the night of hypocrisy is passing and the morning of a better, a purer and a sweeter day is slowly breaking in this beloved State of ours.

When the public eye is opened, as I believe it is, today, we can hope for better things, we can look forward to a brighter morrow.

I believe that the sentiment which occasioned the uprising against this kind of law in the state of Vermont has moved on to New Hampshire and Maine, as the waves of old ocean moves to the shore.

It strikes my mind that the people of these two states are convinced that this insincere, this nonsensical law is not the law suited to modern ideas. It has had its time of life. It has corrupted the political, the moral and the social conditions of our State long enough, and it should now be relegated to the place to which we consign all laws that have outlived their usefulness and effectiveness; if it can ever be said that this amendment has ever been useful or effective.

I believe that it is your duty, today, to give your support to the minor.

ity report of the committee. I believe it is your duty to vote in accordance with your own belief, in accordance with the dictates of your own conscience. And I further believe that any representative here who votes by this rule will be respected by his constituents wherever they may be. The man who wins confidence and respect, today, is he who stands for right.

Let your votes speak for the people of Maine, of which you are a part. Tell them that they may have an opportunity to vote upon this law. You do no more than your duty when you do this. It is for them to act. And I believe that they will act for the best interests of our State. I believe that they will lift this heavy burden from the shoulders of our beloved State so that she may take her rightful place among her sister states of New England.

Then she will stand, Maine, splendid Maine, the beautiful queen of all New England, her crown studded with the magnificent jewels with which nature has so bountifully endowed her; her platform the rugged mountain of stone; her music the beating of the waves upon the stern and rocky shore. Standing upright, her face kissed and glorified by the beams of the smiling sun, she will then proclaim, in truth and in fact—I lead. (Applause).

Mr. MILLS of Stonington: Mr. Speaker, when this question was first brought before the temperance committee, the committee was invited to look at the subject in "the white light of facts." And I have assumed, up to the present time that we were supposed, as members of this House, to have the privilege of looking at the subject in the same light, "the white light of facts." But as I have listened to the eloquence of the gentleman from Lewiston, it seems to me that he would have us look at the bill through the white light of some of the facts and the rest of the facts he would have us see "through a glass darkly." He expresses himself in very broad and liberal terms and in glittering generalities; all his ideas are presented in the most eloquent language; but, Mr. Speaker, he has failed to give any statistics or to quote a single fact in

proof of the statements he has made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many states in the Union which have had years of experience in both the prohibitory and the license law, and as far as my investigations go there is not one iota of evidence in the history of those states to justify the conclusion that a license law would be beneficial to the people of Maine. On the other hand, the great prosperity of those states under a prohibitory law is a strong argument in favor of that law. Take the state of Kansas, which is cited, today, by the gentleman who has just spoken. Kansas enacted a prohibitory law in 1880, and made it a part of the constitution of the state. Men who opposed that law predicted, as men are predicting it in this State, today, that the abolition of the saloons in Kansas would injuriously affect the material prosperity of the state, but in 1887, according to a statement issued by ex-Governor John A. Martin of Kansas, the value of the real and personal property in that state had increased from \$160,000,000 to \$300,000,000. The number of schools had increased from a little over 5000 in 1880, to 8500 in 1887. The number of acres of cultivated land had increased from 8,000,000 to 16,000,000; and in the same length of time, according to that statement, the tax rate in the state of Kansas decreased almost 20 per cent.

Now men talk about the increased cost and expense of enforcing the prohibitory law, but the greatest era of prosperity, of material, moral and intellectual development of growth in country, cities, and towns ever witnessed on the American continent has been illustrated in Kansas since the enactment of the prohibitory law, even though it has been but partially enforced. And yet men claim that a license system would bring a large amount of money into the county treasuries. But statistics do not prove that statement. It is easy to make general statements here, but it is another thing to back them up with facts. Take the city of Lincoln in the license state of Nebraska, for example. In 1901 Lincoln supported no less than 42 saloons, from which she gained a

revenue of more than \$40,000, all of which was supposed to be used for school purposes only, and yet in that year Lincoln paid to its High school teachers an average of only \$75 per month, while Topeka in the prohibition state of Kansas, paid an average of \$83 per month. Lincoln paid to its teachers of all grades \$66 a month on an average; while Topeka, which has not had a licensed saloon in the last 13 years, paid to its teachers an average of \$76 per month. And you may reasonably ask, "how can these things be? How is it that the cities of Kansas can pay more wages to its teachers, build more miles of railroad, support more schools and more churches, and give more than three times as much for benevolent purposes than do the cities in the neighboring license states and at the same time pay a tax rate not more than two-thirds as high?" But when you take into consideration the great prosperity which has attended Kansas under the prohibitory law, this condition is not so surprising; when you remember that out of the 104 counties of Kansas in the year 1901 there were 44 which did not have a single pauper, and out of those 44 counties there were 37 which, in the April term of court of 1902, did not have a criminal entry on the docket. Find a parallel in a licensed state if you can.

It is estimated that the prohibitory law of Kansas saves the taxpayers of that state no less than \$200,000 annually in the poor department alone. But we hear the men who are advocating this bill, say they admit all this, that Kansas has wonderfully prospered, but, they say, her remarkable and unprecedented prosperity is due to some other cause, it is due to the industry of the people, to the fertility of the soil, to the mildness of the climate, the height of the mountains or the depth of the valleys—it is due to anything and everything except the enforcement of the prohibitory law; but it can't be due to that, because the distinguished gentleman from Portland (Mr. Swett), at the opening of this session told us that on account of the strict enforcement of that law, a

drought was then prevailing over the once fertile fields of Cumberland county. And in all fairness it may be admitted that some other cause may have contributed to the wonderful growth and rapid development of the state of Kansas; but if there have been other causes it is a significant fact that those causes have not operated, or if operating, have produced just the opposite effects than in the neighboring license states. It is a significant fact that taxation has gone up in Nebraska under license, and down in Kansas under prohibition. It is an interesting fact to know that the valuation of property has gone down in Nebraska and up in Kansas. It may be that some other cause does bring about this prosperity, but I would like to ask, and I ask in all sincerity that the gentlemen explain to us what those causes are. Tell us why it is in the year 1899 the number of business failures in Kansas were only 84, while those in Missouri, bordering Kansas on the east, went up to 267? Why is it that in the next year the number of failures in Kansas were only 82 and those in Missouri were 329? True, Missouri is a somewhat larger state than Kansas, but the number of failures was entirely out of proportion to the number of the population. I would like to have these things explained.

And while they are explaining these things, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it would be well for them to consider the condition in our neighboring state of Massachusetts, and tell us why it is that the same relation exists there between the license and the no license cities as I have shown to exist between the cities of Kansas and those of Nebraska? Why is it in the city of Cambridge from 1875 to 1885 the valuation of property went down three million dollars under a license law, while from 1885 to 1900 the valuation of property increased thirty-six million dollars under a no license law?

Perhaps you will say that it is unfair to take any city in Massachusetts as a comparison; you may say that local causes are operating there and produce the different effects, causes with which we are not acquainted. But

when you take a single city in Massachusetts and find that prosperity and growth constantly attend that city under a no license system, and that poverty and pauperism always follow the enactment of a license law, it seems to me that this is a logical argument in favor of prohibition. And when you find that that condition is duplicated in 100 other cities of Massachusetts, it seems to me that that strengthens the prohibitory argument. It is unreasonable for men to stand before this House and prophesy a glorious future for any law that has had no glory in its past; it is illogical for men to predict a grand success for any law whose past has been marked by failure.

Notice for a moment some of the results in Maine. You will all agree, I think, that there is an attempt being made to enforce the prohibitory law in the county of Androscoggin. What are the results? In January, 1902, there were 26 arrests for drunkenness in Androscoggin county. In January, 1901, there were 38 arrests. In January of this present year under the enforcement of the law, and Mr. Cummings' administration, there were only seven arrests for drunkenness—and those largely due to the fact that just prior to Mr. Cummings taking the oath of office the liquor dealers got rid of their goods at marked-down prices. Take the county of Kennebec. In 1902 there were no less than 48 arrests for drunkenness. In January, 1901, there were 68. In January, 1903, under the enforcement of the law, there were nine arrests for drunkenness. Now the gentleman who has just spoken admits that the purpose of all temperance law is to restrict the amount of drunkenness, what more can he ask for than this?

Not only so; but recently a man from Massachusetts put up at one of the hotels in Lewiston. After being shown to his room he sent down to the office for a bottle of liquor. Word was sent back that liquor was not being sold, the law was being enforced. A second time the gentleman sent down and insisted on a bottle of liquor being sent up. The proprietor sent back word that if God Almighty was stopping at that hotel he could not buy liquor at \$50 a drink. It

may be that the enforcement of this law causes a devastating drought in Cumberland county, but if such is the case, I believe, if there is no alternative, it would be a good investment for the State of Maine to pension the poor farmers of Cumberland county and let this good work go on.

A license law may mean a revenue for the State, and that every county in the State will have a balance of \$10,000 in its treasury at the end of the first year. But, if we are going to make men drunk for the sake of having a balance in the county treasury, it seems to me that we may as well go back to the days of slavery. If we are going to sell men's characters for the sake of the almighty dollar, we may as well go back to the days of the auction block and sell their bodies as well.

Now this man Doughtney comes down here from Massachusetts; and I have authority for the statement that he was paid by the liquor dealers to come here and talk in the interests of resubmission. He says among other things that the enforcement of the prohibitory law is an infringement on the personal rights of our citizens. But this is a theory which belongs to the dark days of the world; it is not the theory upon which the American government is built, and it is not the principle upon which modern civilization advances. Five years ago Spain was carrying on a war with barbarian methods in the island of Cuba. When she was remonstrated with, she defiantly said: "Whose business is it?" The United States answered: "It is mine." The Spaniard Weyler was butchering, torturing and putting to death the innocent citizens of Cuba. When it was undertaken to restrain him, he, like Thomas N. Doughtney, boldly said: "Whose business is it?" And every patriotic, law-loving citizen of the United States answered: "It is mine." So, all along the years from Plymouth Rock to the Philippines, the United States has been giving grand object lessons, teaching to the world the fact that "no man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself." So when the liquor business of this country deprives a million families of the comforts and necessities of life, tem-

perance people have a right to stand and say: "This is our business." And in this position they are upheld by the highest court in the land. Allow me to read a few lines which came from the pen of Mr. Doughtney about ten years ago. This is found in his autobiography, page 451:

"Granting nearly all that the opponents of prohibition allege against either its theory or its practice, its principles or its administration, the great fact remains undenied and undeniable, that, on the whole, prohibition in Maine has worked well, and that it has done an amount of good that will only be fully known at the Judgment Day, when all secrets are laid bare and everything will be seen in its true light.

"Maine under prohibition has been infinitely better and happier than Maine would have been without prohibition, or than other states are, today, without it. This is the one all-important point, compared with which all minor points sink into insignificance. Thousands of homes in Maine under prohibition are peaceful and prosperous, which in Maine without prohibition would have been wretched, if not utterly wrecked. Thousands of men in Maine under prohibition are honest, industrious, sober, who in Maine without prohibition would have been dishonest, idle, and intemperate. Thousands of women in Maine under prohibition are happy wives and honest mothers, who in Maine without prohibition would be the despairing wives of confirmed drunkards or the disgraced mothers of convicted felons."

These are the words of a man who came here to the hearing before the committee on temperance and denounced the prohibitory law as a failure and a farce. This shows something of the character of some of the men who have been advocating this bill.

Now we are told by the author of this measure that the sentiment for resubmission comes from no lawless class, and with this statement in mind I recently took up a batch of petitions for resubmission, the first one that came to my notice bore these names in part. And these may be the law-loving law-abiding citizens of Maine, but their names are prima facie

evidence against them. They run like this and in this order:

Panlia, Letaurneau, Grandin, Rancourt, Bashan, Ranco, Landrey, Mahew Ranco, Oby, Berette, Bellinau, Tardiff, Bellineau, Laurdiene. Those names you will find on the petition for resubmission. I stopped there because, while I have devoted some little time to the study of language, no man, unless he can speak French and German fluently, unless he has his Italian and Hebrew and Latin and Greek and Arabic upon his tongue's end, can read more than half of the names on that petition and pronounce them accurately. I tell you that they are not the law-loving, law-abiding citizens of Maine. Far from it. They appear to be representatives of the slums of Italy, with occasionally the name of a wandering Jew. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the discretion of this House will prevail, as was suggested by the gentleman who preceded me. I trust also that you will listen to the great majority of remonstrances from the respectable people of Maine which have flowed into this House from Aroostook county to Oxford. I trust that this bill will be defeated. And yet mere defeat is not enough. We want to bury this proposition beneath such an avalanche of votes that Thomas N. Doutney of Massachusetts will never again have an opportunity to come into this Legislature and talk in the interests of resubmission. (Applause).

Mr. Oakes of Auburn, moved to adjourn until 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Libby of Mechanic Falls, called attention to a proposed excursion to Portland in the afternoon and said that when the vote was taken on this question, he desired every member to have an opportunity to record and declare his vote.

Mr. Sutherland of Biddeford, moved to amend the motion to adjourn by making it 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. Swett moved to amend by making it 9 o'clock, tomorrow morning.

Mr. Sutherland accepted the amendment.

Mr. Davis of Waterville, said that he would like the adjournment made till

early afternoon, that personally he expected to be away, tomorrow, and he agreed with the gentleman from Mechanic Falls (Mr. Libby) that it was very important that as many members as possible should be here during the discussion and the vote. It seemed to him that the eloquence could be expended in an hour or two or condensed.

Mr. Perkins of Wilton, said that it seemed to him the question was important enough to demand the forbearance of the House, today, and that they should remain here long enough to hear the discussion for and against resubmission "And I move that we forbear long enough to hear the speakers who have ably prepared themselves to do justice to the subject." (Applause).

Mr. Manson of Pittsfield, inquired why the matter could not be taken up in the afternoon, tomorrow, and go on with the regular business of the House in the morning.

Mr. Swett of Portland, inquired what the question was before the House.

The Speaker stated that it was on the question that when the House adjourns it adjourn till tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

The question being put,

The motion was agreed to.

MR. SMITH of Hartland: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It is from a sense of obligation, rather than from choice that I am prompted to attempt to briefly discuss the issue under consideration, for fully do I realize that it is altogether unbecoming and improper for me to participate in this debate, with those who are in a position to intelligently digest the merits or demerits of resubmission. But when there are questions pending, pertaining to the honor, integrity and morality of our commonwealth, it matters not how humble our sphere may be. It is not only a duty we owe to ourselves but to those who have entrusted within our keeping their interests and protection, to those who have given to us the care and welfare of our beloved State, to raise our voices in no uncertain tone. Now for the first question our resubmissionist friends lay great stress and emphasis on, is why we are not willing to submit to

the people our "temperance laws," if we are confident their verdict would be for retaining them. Now I contend that when we as representatives should so vote we would by that very act and deed, lend our untimely efforts and example to the great mass of unthinking voters, and give new courage, new life and existence to the rum element of our respective committees, and secondly because of the vast amount of money and influence, not only from within our borders but from the united efforts of every rum distiller throughout the length and breadth of our land, which would make the result far from being the honest, sober, thoughtful and conscientious expression of the people. Again we find ourselves confronted with the unlimited assertions, that our temperance laws are a fake, farce and a failure, branded with hypocrisy and this appearing to be their paramount reason for resubmission. Now, Mr. Speaker, if our friends generally speaking were as free from a selfish taint as they appear to be honest and sincere in reference to having our laws respected, why in the name of common decency, on the same supposition, do they not put forth a portion of their most strenuous efforts to have the repeal, and the resubmission of our fish and game laws, the gambling laws, and the Sabbath laws, including the 10 commandments. Again I ask, who are they that have impaired, impeached and disregarded our statutes? Who has told us in mournful and solemn tones of our complex and ineffectual law? Is it the temperate, law-abiding citizens? I believe that every person within the sound of my voice knows who it is and knows it well. The very fact that the saloon keeper, the hotel keeper, the rum dealer and the liquor sympathizers are so earnest and untiring in their efforts for resubmission is sufficient and conclusive evidence alone to convince me that our present laws are good enough for us to retain a while longer. But they tell us that Vermont has voted 1500 strong for high license. Have you heard them say anything about the 58,000 voters that changed their vote in the state of Massachusetts and voted down forever high license.

The county jail at Auburn, during the month of January, 1902, contained 91 convicts, the corresponding month of the present year they had but 47, during the month first mentioned 38 cases were committed there from the effects of intoxicating liquors, while but seven were placed behind the bars for the month just closed. Here in this very city I am officially informed that the same condition exists, and so on and on throughout the entire State. In Massachusetts, this state having the best enforced license law, there are 33 prisoners to every 10,000 inhabitants, while in Maine there are but 13 to every 10,000 people.

And still they tell us there is no argument against this distilled damnation, only through local option and high license. May God forgive them if we never do. And if the promoters of this fake failure of our temperance laws would work as earnestly, honestly and patiently in behalf of our present system as they do to stamp upon its fair name, there would be one great revival, one grand reunion, one hearty cooperation in behalf of temperance and humanity. But our resubmissionist friends are but an ill assorted team, one element is prancing for resubmission because it has been frightened into efforts to repeal prohibition by the sign of the growing disposition to enforce it. The other is pulling for resubmission because it imagines that through it prohibition will be reaffirmed, unlike in color, size, build, gate and disposition, harnessed neck and crop together, each headed in a different direction and neither able to look toward what it is after without breaking the other from what it wants. Republicans, let us not forget that in that wreath of ideas, that has formulated the policies and moulded the destinies of our party, which has given birth to the purest minds, the bravest men and the noblest leaders ever wrought from the human race. That temperance was foremost and uppermost in completing their great life work. Let us not forget, that there is inserted in our pledge and platform, our sacred promise to use our every effort in behalf of prohibition. Now if party ties and party affiliations are of any consequence and if we are

still to carry the banner of victory, it beseeches and implores us to stand true to our colors, honest by our promises and loyal to our platform.

Gentlemen, I believe that when I appeal to you to vote against resubmission, that it is an appeal for the destitute widows with the canopy of heaven as her only shelter, an appeal for the homeless children with their aching pangs of hunger, for the mothers that are trudging their way over the hills to the poor house, and yes, for the young men, the life blood, youth and vigor of our land that are marching into the bottomless pit and filling a drunkard's grave. On this occasion let us resolve not to sink in the scales of duty but to cherish this tradition of our fathers that has been handed down to us untarnished, unmitigated and unrepining. Let us resolve to once again unfurl the everlasting banner "Dirigo" and write on its folds in letters of burnished gold "prohibition." Let us resolve to give this question, today, its final resting place, and bury it so deep that even the shrill tones of "Gabriel's" trumpet would fail to resurrect or disturb its peaceful slumbers. (Applause).

On motion of Mr. Randall of Freeport, the vote was reconsidered whereby the House accepted the majority report on resolve in regard to Colby College, and on further motion by the same gentleman the reports, pending their acceptance, were laid upon the table and assigned for Friday of this week.

On motion of Mr. Sewall of Bath,
Adjourned.