

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.

fore the committee and a dozen other prominent men throughout the State were there, and we heard all they had to say; and no one wants to appear before the committee but a member of the House. I do not think it should be re-committed again, but I think the Senate should accept the report of the committee.

Mr. BURNS: Mr. President, I believe even the Senator from Kennebec wishes one of his bills re-committed to another committee.

Mr. MANLEY: No Sir. I have no notion of it.

The question being put upon the motion to reconsider the acceptance of the report, the motion was lost.

On Motion by Mr. Morrison of York the Senate adjourned to meet on Friday, March 6, 1903, at ten o'clock A. M.

HOUSE.

Thursday, March 5, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Cannon of Lowell.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

An Act granting a new charter to the Farmington Village Corporation.

An Act to authorize municipalities to make contracts for water, gas and light.

An Act establishing the salary of the county attorney for the county of Kennebec.

An Act to grant testimonials of honorable service to soldiers who served in the war with Spain.

An Act to extend the charter of the Bluehill Water Company.

An Act to incorporate the Liberty Water Company.

An Act to amend Chapter 266 of the Public Laws of 1892, as amended by Chapters 128 of the Public Laws of 1899 and 167 of the Public Laws of 1901, relating to the militia.

An Act to amend Chapter 159 of the Public Laws of 1901, providing for the retirement of commissioned officers of the militia of the National Guard of the State of Maine.

Resolve in favor of establishing a modern fish hatchery and feeding station at Sebago Lake.

An Act to amend the charter of the city of Auburn. (Read three times and passed to be engrossed under a suspension of the rules on motion of Mr. Oakes of Auburn.)

An Act concerning Auburn Free Public Library. (Read three times and passed to be engrossed under a suspension of the rules on motion of Mr. Oakes of Auburn.)

An Act to amend Chapter 94 of the Public Laws of 1887, relating to agricultural societies.

An Act to repeal Sections 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Chapter 61 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the rights of married women.

An Act to repeal Section 36 of Chapter 63 of the Revised Statutes, relating to examination before judges of probate.

An Act to authorize executors and administrators to provide for the perpetual care of burial lots.

An Act to amend Chapter 67 of the Revised Statutes and Chapter 143 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of guardians for persons insane.

An Act relating to the authority of court over guardians ad litem or next friend.

An Act relating to the acknowledgment of deeds.

An Act relating to the waiving of the provisions of wills by widow.

An Act relating to the attachment of partnership property.

An Act to repeal Section 16 of Chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes, relating to duties of county commissioners.

An Act to amend Paragraph 5 of Section 62 of Chapter 81 of the Revised Statutes, relating to property exempt from attachment and execution.

An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 86 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 157, Public Laws of 1893, relating to trustee suits.

An Act relating to the dissolution of attachments by filing bond.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes, relating to duties payable by public officers.

An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes and Chapter 225 of the Public Laws of 1893, relating to fees of registers of deeds. (Tabled pending first reading on motion of Mr. Abbott of Shapleigh).

An Act to prevent injury to books and works of art.

An Act to repeal Sections 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of Chapter 133 of the Public Laws of 1897, relating to pardons.

An Act relating to the commitment of the insane, and to abolish the right of appeal to justices of the peace and quorum.

The following petitions, bills, were presented and referred.

Judiciary.

By Mr. Favour of Kittery: Remonstrance of Albert Lord and 15 others of Eliot against the bill establishing a municipal court of Eliot and Kittery so far as it pertains to Eliot.

By Mr. Page of Drew Plantation: Bill, An Act to amend chapter three, section seventy, of the private statutes relating to plantations.

Also: Bill, An Act amendatory to chapter 24 of the private statutes relating to paupers.

By Mr. Littlefield of Rockland: Bill, An Act to amend section 15 of chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, relating to recording locations of railroads.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Thompson of Orono: Bill, An Act conferring certain power upon the trustees of the University of Maine.

Railroads, Telegraphs and Expresses.

By Mr. McIntyre of Waterford: Petition of H. C. Bacon and 77 others of Woodstock for telephone lines and connections.

By Mr. Mewer of Old Orchard: Petition of M. E. Hill and 100 others praying for an act to provide for the comfort and safety of persons and property, in Old Orchard during the months of June, July, August and September, of each year.

Also, petition by the selectmen of Old Orchard for same.

By Mr. Twambly of Kennebunkport: Bill, An Act to incorporate the Kittery and York Telephone Company.

By Mr. Putnam of Danforth: Bill, An Act to incorporate the Houlton and Danforth Electric Railroad Company.

Commerce.

By Mr. Pike of Lubec: Bill, An Act to authorize Clarence H. Clark to extend and maintain a wharf in Lubec narrows.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Taylor of Wiscasset: Remonstrance of H. E. Webster and 40 others of Newcastle against reduction of tax on savings banks.

Agriculture.

By Mr. Josselyn of Portland: Petition of S. W. Thaxter & Company and others, wholesale merchants of Portland, that adequate provision be made for the extension of information in relation to the sale of feeding stuffs.

By Mr. Cameron of Bangor: Bill, An Act relating to feeding stuffs.

State Lands and State Roads.

By Mr. Campbell of Cherryfield: Bill, An Act to make certain the mean-

ing of the language "Timber and grass" relating to the public lots so called in unincorporated townships in State of Maine.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Sturgis of Standish: Petition of E. Porter and 23 others for the enactment of a law prohibiting the putting of sawdust or other mill waste into any of the tributaries of the Crooked river.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Allen of Sanford: Remonstrance of George C. Jones and 17 others, registered guides, against the enactment of any license law for hunters wherein said license fee shall exceed the sum of ten dollars.

Ways and Bridges.

By Mr. Putnam of Danforth: Resolve in favor of building a bridge over the west branch of the St. Croix river connecting Indian Township with the town of Princeton.

Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. Campbell of Cherryfield: Bill, An Act for the repeal of Special Laws relating to migratory fish in Pleasant river in Washington county.

Placed on File.

By Mr. Davis of Waterville: Petition of D. H. Mudgett and 40 others of Dexter in favor of Resubmission.

By Mr. Hill of Winterport: Remonstrance of members of Universalist, Adventist, Baptist and Free Baptist Churches of Auburn representing 673 people against same.

Also: Remonstrance of members of the M. E. Church of Machias against same.

Also: Remonstrance of members of M. E. Church of Bath against same.

Also: Remonstrance of members of Washington St. Baptist Church of Eastport against same.

Also: Remonstrance of Frank Coney and 15 others of Auburn against same.

Also: Remonstrance of Baptist and Congregational Churches of Madison against same; of M. E. Church of Greenville; of M. E. Church of Farmington; of M. E. Church of Eastport; of the Baptist Church of Brunswick; of members of Center St. Congregational Church of Machias; of members

of First Baptist Church of Damariscotta; of members of Baptist Church of Orono; of members of the Universalist Church of Machias; of members of the Free Baptist Church; of members of Williston Church; of members of Congregational Church of New Gloucester; of members of the First Baptist Church of Sanford; of members of Bodwell Street M. E. Church of Hallowell; of members of the Congregational Church of Orono; of members of Town Improvement Society of Skowhegan; of members of Corless Street Church of Bath; of members of Pearson's Memorial Mission; of the Universalist and Congregational Churches of Hiram; of members of Westbrook Congregational Church; of members of North Parish Congregational Church of Sanford; of members of Beacon St. Church of Bath; of members of the Winter Street Congregational Church of Bath; of members of four churches of Sanford; of members of the First Baptist Church of Skowhegan; of W. L. Rogers and 42 others of Greenville—all against same.

By Mr. Buxton of Abbot: Remonstrance of Henry Hudson and 34 others of Guilford against same.

Cumberland County Delegation.

By Mr. Potter of Brunswick: Petition for increase of salary of Justice of Cumberland Superior Court.

Sagadahoc County Delegation.

By Mr. Sewall of Bath: Petition of J. P. Higgins and 33 others for such amendments to the proposed act in relation to Merrymeeting Bay and Arrowsic bridges as will authorize the city of Bath and town of Woolwich to convey to the county of Sagadahoc the People's Ferry, so called, to reduce the tolls at least one-half and place the duty of maintaining said ferry upon said county; of R. A. Munro and 27 others; of F. D. Farnham and 27 others—all for same.

Orders.

On motion of Mr. Littlefield of Rockland,

Ordered, That the committee on the judiciary inquire into the expediency of complying with the accompanying

request as to the change of time when the municipal year shall begin in the city of Rockland, and report by bill or otherwise.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Goodwin from the committee on judiciary, on petition for an act to amend Section 8 of Chapter 75 of the Revised Statutes regulating the descent of personal property of intestates, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Littlefield from the same committee on petition of K. M. Sanborn and others praying for a law regulating the structures built on the shores of the interior waters of Maine, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Newcomb from the committee on legal affairs, on bill, An Act to incorporate the Penobscot River Power Company, reported that same be referred to the committee on interior waters.

Mr. Kelley from the same committee, on petition of W. T. C. Runnells and 104 legal voters of Searsport, for abolishment of the Searsport Municipal court, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Farnsworth from the committee on sea and shore fisheries, on petition of Amos F. Carleton and others, praying that Section 40, Chapter 40 of the Revised Statutes, relating to smelt fishing, be changed reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Pike from the same committee, on bill, An Act to amend Section 41 of Chapter 284 of the Public Laws of 1901, reported ought not to pass.

Mr. Sturgis from the committee on towns, on bill, An Act to amend Muschel Ridge plantation to South Thomaston, reported that same be referred to the next Legislature, for the reason that sufficient legal notice had not been given.

Mr. Potter from the committee on judiciary, on bill, An Act to amend an act, entitled "An Act to incorporate the city of Old Town," reported ought to pass.

Mr. Smith from the same committee reported in a new draft and ought to pass bill, An Act to amend Section 16 of Chapter 72 of the Revised Statutes, relating to suits on probate bonds.

Mr. Smith from the same committee, reported in a new draft and ought to

pass bill, An Act to enable cities and towns to establish permanent fuel yards.

Mr. Allen from the same committee, on petition of the Fryeburg Electric Light Company, praying that its charter may be amended, reported bill, An Act relating to the Fryeburg Electric Light Company.

Mr. Oakes from the committee on legal affairs, on bill, An Act to make valid certain doings of the assessors of Norway for the year 1902, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Campbell from the same committee, on Bill, An Act to authorize the Kennebunk Electric Light Company to issue bonds, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Barker from the same committee, on Bill, An Act to amend the charter of the city of Calais, relating to ward and district lines, reported ought to pass.

Same gentleman from the same committee, reported in a new draft and ought to pass bill, An Act in relation to judges of municipal courts.

Mr. Campbell from the same committee, on Bill, An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 30 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 115 of the Public Laws of 1895, and Sections 3 and 4 of Chapter 30 of the Revised Statutes, in relation to dogs, reported ought to pass.

Mr. McFaul from the same committee, on Bill, An Act in regard to the compensation of town officers, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Weeks from the Committee on Judiciary, on resolve providing for a fund for completing the records of the clerk of courts of Lincoln county, reported ought to pass. (Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs).

Mr. Kelley from the Committee on Legal Affairs, reported in a new draft and ought to pass bill, An Act to authorize the Carratunk Power Company to erect and maintain dams across the Carrabasset river in the towns of Embden and Anson.

Mr. Campbell from the same committee, on Bill, An Act to enlarge the powers of the Carrabasset stock farm, reported ought to pass.

Mr. Mills from the same committee, on petition, reported Bill, An Act to prohibit the use of purse and drag seines in the waters of Sargentville Harbor, known as Billing's Cove, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Eaton from the same committee, on resolve for an appropriation for the use of the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, reported ought to pass. (Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.)

Mr. Farnsworth from the same committee, on bills, An Act relating to the sea and shore fisheries, making it lawful to catch lobsters nine inches in length, reported ought not to pass.

Mr. Potter from the Cumberland county delegation, in bill, An Act authorizing the county commissioners of Cumberland county to erect a county building in Portland, reported ought to pass.

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

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves.

An Act to authorize the town of Athens to remove the bodies of deceased persons.

An Act relating to the Young Women's Christian Association of Portland, Maine.

An Act to authorize the Van Buren Water Company to increase its capital stock and bonds.

An Act to amend chapter forty-two of the Public Laws of eighteen hundred ninety-nine relating to the taking of Black Bass in certain lakes in Kennebec and Somerset counties, also Sabattus pond in Androscoggin county as amended by chapter two hundred eighty-seven Public Laws of 1901.

An Act to extend the charter of the Winthrop Cold Spring Water Company.

An Act to enlarge the powers of the Prouts Neck Water Company.

An Act relating to the election and term of office of certain members of the board of assessors, board of overseers of the poor and female members of the school committee of the city of Portland.

An Act relating to Gorham Academy.

Passed to be Engrossed.

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."

Passed to be Enacted.

An Act relating to the Camden Trotting Park Association.

An Act to amend the charter of the Baskahegan Dam Company.

An Act to increase the capital stock of the Ticonic Foot Bridge Company.

An Act to amend Chapter 301 of the Private and Special Laws of 1850, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Portland Widows' Wood Society," as amended by Chapter 145 of the Private and Special Laws of 1879.

An Act to amend the charter of the Lewiston, Brunswick and Bath Street Railway.

An Act to authorize the county commissioners of Somerset county to borrow a sum of money with which to build an extension to the Court House in Skowhegan, in said county.

An Act to amend Chapter 273 of the Public Laws of 1885, relating to the holding of County Teachers' conventions.

An Act amendatory to Section 6 of Chapter 495 of the Special Laws of 1885, entitled "An Act to incorporate the People's Ferry Company."

An Act to authorize the town of Bucksport to retire its bonded indebtedness and to issue new bonds.

An Act to amend Chapter 152 of the Public Laws of 1895, relating to State examination and certification of teachers.

Orders of the Day.

RESUBMISSION.

Unfinished business:

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. COLE of East Livermore: Mr. Speaker, It is with some diffidence that I rise here to express my opinion on this subject. This question has been agitated in the State to quite an extent during the past year, and especially since the campaign of the past year started. Being on the committee on temperance I felt under a little obligation to defend my position. I will admit that in the fall I was partly converted, or at that stage where I hardly knew what was right for me to do when I came into the Legislature, in reference to this question. And so I took a little pains to inform myself. I admit here that there were good men, men of good standing, people of broad minds, of my constituents, who advised me to vote for resubmission. I admit that perhaps there are people here, today, members of this Legislature, who take the same view, who are unbiased in their opinions and have a right from their standpoint to vote for resubmission. But when I came to inquire into this among the quiet, thinking persons of my constituency, I found that a large majority advised me to vote against resubmitting this question to the public. And so I took a little pains to look into this matter, and I took it from the standpoint—although the argument has not been brought up before the committee at our hearings—it has been touched upon a little in our discussion—I took it from the standpoint that members of this Legislature have asked us to vote for resubmission on the ground that it would strengthen our law to re-affirm our belief in prohibition—that they had no doubt but what it would be re-affirmed by a very large majority of the voters of the State. Now, if I believed that from that standpoint it

would be re-affirmed, that the people would not want this amendment repealed, then it seems to me that I should vote against resubmitting this to the people. And why? Because if we think they still believed in the prohibitory law as they did when it was put into the constitution, than why should be subject the people to the excitement and expense of voting again? Many say that it would show the rum power that the people were still of firm belief in this prohibitory law. You know as well as I that the rum power would not take this as final. They do not consider the people when ever in any way they can ply their trade, because it is wholly for gain; and if the influence that is brought against them can in any way be lessened or this law be brought into disrepute, they are willing to be law-breakers still, no matter what pressure may be brought to bear upon them by the communities in which they live.

From the other standpoint, the argument that has been put forth before the committee is, that a local license or a license law would be much preferable to the prohibitory law. I took a little pains to look into the matter. I shall not give you any extended statistics here, today, but I took from different years from different states the per cent. as it had been stated by the attorney generals and chief justices and I found that about 80 per cent. of the crimes in the different states and in this State from year to year, right around 80 per cent., is due to the excess of liquor drinking, that it is due to the liquor traffic. If 80 per cent. is due to the amount of liquor used, then if more liquor is used in the State, of course there is more crime. In Maine according to the census reports of 1890 the conditions were about the same as at the beginning of 1902. Maine averaged one revenue tax to about 700 of the people, and with about the same enforcement they had in the prisons 774 per million of the inhabitants. New Hampshire, in which the enforcement of the prohibitory law was more lax, had 873 per million against 774 prisoners in the State of Maine. Connecticut, with its local option, had 1375 prisoners per million of the inhabitants

against 774 in the State of Maine. Massachusetts, in which local option was practically a high license law for the state because of the greater number of cities, had 2325 per million, prisoners in the prisons against 774 in the State of Maine. And from all this testimony, and I can give more, we see that the amount of crime depends largely on the amount of liquor used.

We hear it stated, and I have heard it within a few days, and we hear the argument throughout the State that local option and high license would curtail the amount of liquor sold. I can hardly see it upon that standpoint. If we have a high license we would have perhaps less saloons than if we had a low license, but those saloons would be run in the interests of rich rum sellers, they would be conducted on a larger scale and in a more elaborate style and they would appeal to the young men who, today would not frequent those low dives. A great deal of stress is laid upon the restrictions that would be put upon these high license saloons. They tell us they are not allowed to have drunkards, that they are not allowed to have minors patronize them, that they are not allowed to run after a certain hour at night, that they are closed on Sundays—they present an elegant picture of the license law. But what are you going to do with the drunkards of today, what are you going to do with graduates of those saloons? They must and will have their liquors the same as they are having them, today, and if those saloons will not sell it to them from the front doors, they will sell it out of the back doors, and even if it is not convenient for them to do it, they will certainly do it because they are in the business for profit. It does not hurt their patronage. Then there will be the same ones who will furnish the liquor to the drunkard and to those who are excluded from the elegant saloons. But you say that the high license men would see that this law was enforced. Would they? If they did not want these drunkards to patronize their saloons, would they not be willing that they should have some lower dive to patronize? I tell you if they are in it for profit they surely will in some way, in some manner, be law-breakers

themselves, they are not the persons who will complain about this law twice. Another thing, supposing they should be the complainants, we know of men and women that have been complainants now for years against the unlawful running of saloons in our cities. What does it amount to when we have officials that can be bribed, when for ten dollars a word can be sent to these saloons and when the officers go there there are no liquors to be found? Those same officials, those same law-breakers that have been breakers of the law for years, are not in a minute going to be transformed into good and honest men. The officials of our cities that have been corrupted under our present laws, can be corrupted under a high license law; and if for ten dollars they can send word to those that are selling illegally, then for ten dollars those same officials will send word to the law-breakers that at such a time they are going to search their places—consequently, the law is not enforced. If the sentiments of the people of a city are against the enforcement or in that direction, will it help that sentiment any to change the law from prohibition to high license? The people of that city who are, today, sneering at the officers that try to enforce the law, will be too well satisfied with the condition to be sneering at the situation if they have a high license law. It is not those people who are sneering at the law, today, that would see that the law was enforced under high license, but it would be the same persons that, today, are working without pay, without money and without price, for the moral promotion of the people of the State. And when we consider that the great influences of our State are in a great measure in favor of prohibition, when we consider that societies are working without profit for the improvement, the education, the up-building and sobriety and all that goes to improve and help our State, when we consider those things, then we can see that a great preponderance of the evidence is in favor of the continuation of prohibition.

Many have preached the beauties of local option. If a city or village wishes for a license law with which to sell

liquors, they say that they should have the privilege to sell. That, I admit had some merit, but at the same time if the law, as I claim it is, is a detriment, if the selling of liquor is a detriment to a community, if it is a detriment to any city to sell it, then I believe it will be a detriment to the adjoining towns and cities. I live in a town where we have a village placed right in the corner and in reality that village is in three different towns. Now, supposing that local option was adopted in one of those towns. It would simply be a curse to the people of the next town, right in the same village if they believed that their village would be better off with prohibition. So that, under all those circumstances, where it might be the vote of one city or one village for liquor, it would be a detriment to the town right across the line that desires prohibition.

The attention of our committee was called to cities that had adopted the enforcement plan thoroughly, Portland, Lewiston and some other cities; and people say that the law has not been enforced, that liquor is still sold. It seems to me that people, in looking at it from that standpoint, take the view that if it is not wholly annihilated, then it is not enforced. We had a man before our committee who was sent as a spy, I should say by his testimony, into Portland under Sheriff Pearson's administration, and he testified before our committee of places which he had found where they sold liquor, little low dives and pocket peddlars, and he admitted that he went into a saloon or eating house there, and that liquor was furnished someone from the hosiery of a waitress, showing that liquor could be obtained. Now, I submit to this Legislature that, when the liquor traffic is driven to such an extremity as that, it is being pretty well enforced. And as to these restrictions of the high license law, that they will not permit saloons to be established within so many feet of a school building. But if it is a good thing, and a grand good thing, why should not our scholars have the privilege of seeing its workings. Why is this law restricted from minors if it is a good thing? I believe that most of our people believe that liquor cannot be

licensed in any form, in any way, that will be a benefit to this State, and I believe that we should not as a Legislature vote to resubmit this question to the people. I do not think that as a whole the people of this State demand it. I do not believe but what if it should be resubmitted to the people it would be re-affirmed by a large majority, and for that reason I shall vote against it. I thank God that we have got beyond the good old days of rum and molasses that we hear so much about. And I want my boy, who has been to this Legislature and looked upon you, gentlemen, I want him to still think that the liquor law is an injury to the State. I have no fear that that boy will go to low dens and commence his liquor drinking in such places, but if he should see people go to gilded saloons, I fear for him. I want that boy brought up, although the law has been poorly enforced I admit in the State of Maine, I want my boy and I believe you want yours brought up to look upon this as a curse, and that it is something that should be suppressed, and that we should look upon those who deal in it as law breakers and people that are working against the interests of the State of Maine. (Applause.)

Mr. DOWNING of Sorrento: Mr. Speaker: As a member of the temperance committee I would like to say a few words upon this question. I shall not vote for resubmission. My reasons for not doing so are that I think the time is not ripe. I am a Prohibitionist, that is, I believe in prohibition when prohibition prohibits; but my love for our grand old mother State will not allow me to join in any eulogy of what pertains to her humiliation and disgrace, and I must say that I cannot look back upon the temperance movement, upon the prohibitory law as it has been carried out in the last 20 years with any degree of pride. When the people give us a great constitutional law, we are in honor bound to try to enforce that law before asking them to repeal it. Some will say, "Haven't we had 20 years of prohibition?" In answer, let me ask you if you consider that levying blackmail upon rumsellers is prohibition? As well might you say that the farmer is practicing prohibition upon his sheep when he gathers his flock in-

to his barn in order that he may shear them, and then turns them out into his pasture in order that when the time comes around he may repeat the process. There is this much difference, however, in the two processes. That is, the farmer takes the whole fleece, but we only take a very small portion of the fleece from the rumseller lest he might kick.

Let us look upon these facts as they are. It is always well at times to take our bearings. What have we been doing in the State of Maine? We have been turning our rumsellers loose and allowing them to corrupt the very flower of our young manhood, and then we have obliged them to divide with us in some small degree the wealth they have thus obtained, and then we boast of the princely revenue we have derived from thus taxing ourselves in the very worst possible way in which we could tax ourselves. Then we have taken our ill gotten gains and built more houses of correction and jails in which to punish the unfortunate victims of our own misdoing. If a spirit from a higher sphere of life should visit the scenes of earth and should look upon the gigantic farce which is going on in Maine, well might he exclaim in the words of the immortal bard of Avon, "What fools these mortals be." But if this condition of affairs shall continue and if this present demand for enforcement shall prove to be as it has too often in the past but a temporary spasm of virtue, if in a little while the rumseller shall be again plying his vocation, if we shall find the same state of affairs that we have had hitherto and nullification shall again have been practiced, then give the people of the State of Maine a chance and they will bury this nullification law under an avalanche of votes so deep that it will never be seen again in this generation.

There is another side to the question, and, we hope, a better one. The law is being enforced at present; the rumsellers are hunting their holes. And I hope this may continue. The people of Maine are watching their officials as they never watched them before, and if this State of things shall last for two years I have no doubt that the happiness and prosperity of our people

will be so advanced and that prohibition will have proved itself to be such a good thing that the question will resolve itself and there will be no demand for resubmission.

I feel strongly tempted at this time to utter a word of warning to the great Republican party. Its principles are dear to my heart and when I see the ship upon which she is embarked, drifting upon the rocks I feel as though a word of warning is necessary. I wish it might come from some abler tongue than mine. But I feel that the warning should be given, even though it come from so humble an instrument as myself. If we do not learn in our platforms to say what we mean and mean what we say, if we do not substitute words of truth for those of hypocrisy and deceit, it behooves us to keep our eyes upon the wall lest the finger of eternal justice be writing there the prophesy of our impending downfall. (Applause.)

Mr. DAVIS of Waterville: Mr. Speaker: Having consumed so much time before the temperance committee of the House in laying before them what I believe to be facts, I do not feel like trespassing very much upon the patience of the House at this time, and I promise you, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that I will not weary you. It seems to me that an apology would be in order to the members of the House from any man who should attempt to enlarge upon a subject that must be familiar to every person present; and yet, Mr. Speaker, possibly the last word has not been said, possibly there may be some few thoughts brought out in the discussion here, today, that may shed more light upon this vexed question; and before indulging in what I have to offer, I wish to offer this prelude to my remarks.

On the floor of this House, yesterday, a gentleman whom I trust knows better—if not, he should have known better—uttered these words:

"Now we are told by the author of this measure that the sentiment for resubmission comes from no lawless class. I recently took up a batch of petitions for resubmission, the first one that came to my notice bearing these

names in part. They may be the names of the law-loving, law-abiding citizens of Maine, but if so, their names are prima facie evidence against them. They run like this and in this order:

Silvio Paganani, Joseph E. Panlia, J. A. Letaurneau, Geo. H. Grandin, Ouillie Rancourt, Joseph Bashan, Jr., Joseph B. Ranco, Frank Ranco, Albert Landrey, Albert Mahew, Joseph B. Ranco, Wm. G. Oby, Edgar E. Berette, Chas. Bellinau, Geo. H. Tardiff, Harry Bellineau, Eugene Laurdiene."

Gentlemen, the history of those names is as follows—their commercial history—although they do not bear Anglo Saxon names: Mr. Joseph Panlia is a furniture dealer; Letaurneau is an attorney of standing in my city; George H. Grandin is a merchant; Ouillie Rancourt is a cemetery boss of a section; Joseph Bashan, Jr., is a present alderman in Ward 7; Frank Ranco is a truckman; William G. Oby is a grocery dealer; Charles Bellineau is also a grocery dealer; George H. Tardiff is a carpenter; Albert Landrey is the honored son-in-law of our member from Waterville; Harry Bellineau is also a merchant and is at present a member of the board of education in Waterville.

He says further: "These may be the names of the law-loving, law-abiding citizens of Maine, but if so, their names are prima facie against them. You will find those names on the petition for resubmission. I stopped there because, while I have devoted some little time to the study of language, I say no man, unless he can speak 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 the petition and pronounce them accurately. I tell you they are not the residents, they are not the law-loving, law-abiding citizens of Maine. Far from it. They are the representatives of the slums of Italy, with occasionally the name of a wandering Jew."

Gentlemen, I submit that this is unfair treatment; and I wondered that the empty benches to which that verdant youth declaimed such rot at an early hour, yesterday morning, did not cry out against him. (Applause.)

In this discussion, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to be eminently fair and just. Before the temperance committee I merely reserved the right to ask questions when statements were made that were not borne out in fact; and in the assertion made at that time that these petitions had behind them no lawless class, I can vouch for the fact that in my own city of Waterville and in the neighboring town of Fairfield, they had on them men who not only represented wealth and influence and the good of their city and their town, but also men who are temperance men, who believe that the farce that is now being perpetrated in the State of Maine and has been perpetrated for 20 years, should be permitted to continue no longer. And with such comment on these honorable gentlemen I pass on to my subject.

The question of resubmission has hardly been touched upon thus far by the gentlemen who have preceded me. The gentleman from East Livermore (Mr. Cole) has told you that this measure is a plea for high license. He knows better. There has been no demand on the part of the citizens who have appeared before this temperance committee for high license. Your committee has been told, that resubmission meant a regulation, that it looked to a regulation of the liquor traffic, that it looked to see you either today or some other day declare that it was right and just when the people of Maine, the voters of Maine, came here and asked to be heard on any question and to express themselves upon that question, that they should have that right. I have repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, told gentlemen who have asked me the question, that if I understood resubmission, it meant not high license, not low license, not option, but local regulation in its final outcome; it aimed first to put before the people of the State of Maine the facts as they exist; and those facts I believe have in part been put before this House. It meant if those facts appealed to you that you would submit this constitutional amendment, which has handled this question at arm's

length, again to the people with the idea that they might again invoke local regulation, that they might again invoke the statutes instead of leaving this question in the constitution where it could not possibly be handled.

Now, to get at this intelligently, Mr. Speaker, I must quote from what I said to the committee, for some of the members have not the facts at their tongue's ends.

"The internal revenue records examined Friday last"—this was Friday before the committee hearing, and I will say to the members of the House that I paid the expenses of a man to go and verify those special taxes of which I shall make mention—"the internal revenue records examined, Friday last, show for the fiscal years 1901 and 1902, 1308 special United States licenses taken out for the sale of liquors at wholesale and retail in the State of Maine; for the fiscal year 1902 up to and including January 30th of this present year, 1127 such licenses were taken out, making from the legal standpoint of the case, one dealer for every 616 of the population. This evidence of the liquor traffic of course can make no account of the hundreds of sellers within our borders who take their chances with the law and procure no license; or rather take out no special tax. To be fair to the friends of constitutional prohibition, and to give them the full benefit of the statistical argument, I will deduct the 186 cancellations and eight transfers as shown by the internal revenue records for the past year, and will add to the list 40 special taxes that have been endorsed for the sale of non-intoxicating beverages such as Uno, Lithia, Germania, Hungarian and other 3 per cent. beverages, leaving in force for the fiscal year 1902, and up to January 30 of this year, 980 United States special taxes or licenses, or one dealer to every 700 of the population. Taking the internal revenue report, the number of special taxes issued in Vermont and in force for 1902, were 533: one to each 642, of the population. The number in New Hampshire for the same year, 1482, or one to each 270 of the population.

"Now for a comparison of the traffic

in Maine at the present time with the traffic from 1883 to 1887 inclusive, the internal revenue statistics show for these years, one retail dealer for each 616 of the population in Maine. The revenue statistics for 1887, when the benefits of constitutional prohibition were supposed to be apparent, showed there were 919 retail distilled liquor dealers in malt liquors and 17 wholesale liquor dealers, making a total of 1028 as shown by the internal revenue records, or practically the same amount of legal business per capita then as at the present time."

The attorney general's report from 1894 up to the present time shows a total of rising 10,000 violations of the liquor law or more than 1300 per year, in spite of the fact that the assertion was made by a prominent member of the Kennebec county delegation recently, that there was practically no liquor sold in Kennebec county. I submit further a list of the fines and costs imposed and collected since 1880, with the exception of the two years 1887 and 1888, as shown by the attorney general's reports, and this list makes a total of fines collected for these years of \$1,582,094.18.

Gentlemen, I ask your careful attention to this list which will show you whether prohibition has been a success in the State of Maine or a failure. The fines and costs collected in 1880 were \$20,815.16. I will not read each succeeding year but I will state that it was a constant increase up to last year when, from \$20,000 in 1880, up till 1902 the total fines collected for that year were \$177,618.23. The years 1885 and 1886 immediately following the incorporation of prohibition into the constitution, show respectively \$34,517.57 and \$29,693.99 in fines collected against \$170,354.23 and \$177,618.23 in the years 1901 and 1902. Whatever these figures may prove to you, gentlemen of the House, they show to me a constantly increasing disregard of law. I believe I stand here before you a consistent temperance advocate, and I say to you, gentlemen, that it is the wonder of many ardent, earnest temperance men in this State that the temperance people, are willing year after year without question to kiss the rod that smites them.

The temperance people came to this House two years ago and they showed the conditions existing, they told you that from the judges on your bench, down to the lowest man in the employ of the county or the State, that there was a disregard of law. They told you that they had appealed to the courts and had appealed in vain; they told you that the reply they received from the courts, and from county officials, and from the sheriffs, was that this law could not be enforced, that public sentiment was not behind it. There has come over the situation a wonderful change. After years of growing disregard of law, after multiplication of fines, after substitution of fines for license openly, in the daylight, they have all at once come to the conclusion that the prohibitory law can be enforced. It is a wonderful revelation. They told you two years ago when you were asking a vote on this question that the law would be enforced if the people wanted it enforced. You asked them to enforce by a very large majority. You have been met by substantially two years of refusal since that time, and now you come again to a discussion of this question; and I would like to speak to the consciences and hearts of every member in this House when I say I do not believe there can come to this Legislature at this session a question that is fraught with so much interest to this State as the question that is now before you. What you shall do with your bridges, what you shall do with your water ways, what you shall do with your finances, with your officers, with your salaries, and, I had almost said, with your schools, sinks into insignificance when you bring this question up for consideration and for settlement.

Resubmission from the standpoint of the men who are presenting it means an opportunity to go before the people of the State of Maine and say to them, "Will you continue this farce any longer?" It means that it is a protest, a righteous protest, against the state of things that has prevailed. It means that the State of Maine, her good citizenship—and you have an illustration of it in your petitions here in Augusta—it means that your good citi-

zenship of the State of Maine demands that there be no longer disregard of that there be no longer disregard of law. It means that the city of Waterville, the city of Portland and other cities in this State are not satisfied when the sheriffs and the deputy sheriffs of those cities go into the larger towns and dictate to them how they shall vote. It means, gentlemen, that if this question goes to the people and they say they are dissatisfied with this thing, that they might place it upon a plain, righteous basis; that they will say, "We of Waterville know what our domestic policy shall be. We do not believe that this thing should run riot. We see no reason why these men should be allowed to go on in unrighteous, illegal traffic, but we do want the right to say that statutory law shall be enacted which shall give us here in this town and in this city the right to say whether this shall go on here or whether it shall not."

Mr. Speaker, I have not asked a gentleman on the floor of this House to vote for this measure. It is a measure that must appeal to them. Most of you represent the dominant party in this State, and as has been truly said by the gentleman who preceded me, that party is on trial. According to your decision, today, you will be judged. I do not look to see this question settled, today. I look to see nothing more than a reasonable protest made against the condition of things that has prevailed, but sometime, it may be two years, it may be four, and it may be six—the thin end of the wedge has been driven, possibly you may say with muffled hammer—but before six years shall have passed that wedge will rend this party in twain unless you listen to the wishes of the people. The men who come to you and ask that the people of the State be given an opportunity to express themselves on this question, tell you that a generation has passed since this measure became constitutional law. They have come to me and have said: "We fully believed that when this measure was put into the constitution, there would be no question about its enforcement." The people of Maine would honor constitutional law, but you have the result before you and you must decide this ques-

tion, not by the oratory that will follow after I am through, but you must decide it by the facts as you find them. The very protests that are made, the very efforts that are made to retain the law, are all arguments in favor of this question.

I apprehend that there can be but one real reason why the members of this House will refuse to give the people again a chance to say whether they shall reaffirm this law, or whether they shall vote it down, for that is all there is to it, and that reason is this: Members living in rural districts, living in the smaller towns that are practically free from liquor drinking and using, tell you and me that they fear the results if the question goes to the people and the people vote for statutory law and local regulation as they might do. They say: "What would become of the town of Buxton?" my old home. Portland is only 15 miles away. The young men could take the train or a team, they could go to the city of Portland and could obtain their liquor, if Portland under local regulation voted for some form of license. That is all true, and I will admit that to those men who do not know the bad citizenship we are creating under this law in our larger towns, this is a very strong argument. But I have only to say to you that those saloons, those dives, those holes, are in existence in those places, today. The arrests in our large cities show it. There were 83 of them, I am told, in the city of Portland, last year, among women. I say, and my friend Mr. Hill from Buxton knows this to be true, that young men who live in those towns, today, go into those cities, and they do not go into an open door, but they skulk into the back door where their friends who have known them do not see them and where they remain sometimes all night, and from which they come out besmirched and bespotted, their manhood tarnished, and all because these things are made possible. I asked Mrs. Stevens when she made her appeal in this House to the women, whether they wanted the saloons near the home and the schoolhouse and the church: I asked her if it were not true that at present the saloon in its worst

form in our State was not already there, and the only reply she made me was: "There are no licensed saloons in those large towns." I asked Mrs. Stevens if she wanted the temperance committee to understand that that was her answer to the question; and she told me that she did.

Whether you look at this question from the standpoint of the statistics, whether you look at it from the standpoint of men who recognize a social demand for liquor in the State of Maine that you have got to deal with, or whether you look at it from the narrow standpoint, it is all the same; you have the question before you and you must settle it. The argument that your constituency in your little town or your little village does not want you to vote for resubmission, is a fallacious argument. You have a constituency, but it is not bounded by the confines of your town, the 300 or 500 or the 1000 inhabitants, your constituency is the voting population of the State of Maine, your constituency is the wife, the mother, the child, all over this State, who demands protection from the evils that have run riot in the city of Portland, and this is also true of other cities in the State. I speak of Portland because at the present time I suppose they have as nearly enforcement as in any city or town in the State. In that city the liquor traffic has been driven into holes and into corners, and they tell us among the lawless and not the law-loving class. I am told on high authority that little children in the city of Portland have acted as spies on the officers of the law. I am told that they have even carried and sold liquor. But we are also told, when we present this view, that the place for this traffic, if we must have it, is in this class. Gentlemen, I appeal to you, that class of all others in the State is a class that we should teach to be law-abiding and law-loving citizens; and the time is coming when, as I said, if we do not do this, the question will be taken up by the people themselves and will be settled. It is for us to say whether the people of Maine shall have the right to settle this question again for themselves or to restate it or to take

it from the constitution and make it a statutory question that can be handled by each city and town unhampered. It is for us to say whether there is anything in these statistics, whether there is anything in the question worthy of our consideration. It is for us to say whether the policy that we believe are right, shall prevail, or whether the State of Maine as a whole and not as detached cities and towns, shall have the right to settle this question. (Applause).

MR. LIBBY of Mechanic Falls: Mr. Speaker, In approaching the discussion of this question for a moment—I shall certainly not detain you at any length—I desire to do so with the utmost fairness and candor, and to accord to every man, every citizen of this State the same right which I claim for myself, to decide this matter, and to vote upon it according to the dictates of his own conscience. That is what I propose to do; and I hope and trust that no man upon the floor of this House, or elsewhere will allow himself to be swayed or swerved from the same line of duty.

Now, in the first place, I desire to remark that I never did, and I never expect to appear against a referendum to the people. I always stood by that; and I appreciate all that has been said and all the harrangues that have been made by the gentlemen upon the other side of this question in regard to the referendum to the people—that, when the people call for a reference of a question to them it should be referred. My difference with them upon that matter is that the people have not called—there has been no call from the people for a referendum in regard to this question. It has been manufactured, to a large degree—but it is not very large, at that. If we are to consider even the petitions and remonstrances which have come into this case, in the hearing before the committee, and before this Legislature since the hearing by the committee, they stand at least ten to one against this position; and if that argues anything, it does not certainly argue that the people as a body are here demanding or asking for this reference to them. Does the gentleman who last spoke upon this question, and who has har-

rangued so learnedly in the interests of the Republican party—I could hardly do equal justice to it myself, if I tried—(Applause.) Has he considered that the last vote, and the last voice which has ever come from the people of this State upon this matter, has been in the very opposite direction? Does he not know that the sheriff in Kennebec county and other counties of the State, were at the very last election, elected by the revolting Republican vote of this State simply because those Democratic methods promised to enforce the prohibitory law and is not that the last voice from the people of this State upon this question, which he might very well consider and heed? I fail to hear this clamor which others say they can hear. I fail to see upon the political horizon of this State any cloud which threatens. I do not know but it may be there. My vision may not be clear, my hearing may be dulled; but I fail to hear it; but, as I have said before, the very last sign of the times that I saw written across the heavens of the political atmosphere and sky was in the very opposite direction.

It is said that this law is a bantling that is hustled about and owned by nobody. I would ask the other side of this question, whose law it is if it is not the law of the people of this State? It has been upon our statute books for half a century. Time and time and time again it has been reiterated in the platforms of the party which I represent in a humble degree in this State at this time. Legislature after Legislature, sent here by the people of this State, have re-enacted and reinforced its provisions time after time. And year in and year out since this constitutional provision was placed in the fundamental law of the State has that same thing been done. My brother from Waterville (Mr. Davis) finds great cause for complaint in the fact that a constitutional provision exists here in addition to statute law. What effect can a constitutional provision have so long as the statute law remains? And what would be the legitimate effect which my brother would receive and derive from the working out of this constitutional provision, if it were not in order to get

at the statute law in order to change or repeal it? My brother does not tell us what elaborate scheme or arrangement he would have. He does not give us the details of that great and glorious enactment which he would have if he could only have a chance to enact it, by which the liquor traffic of this State would be regulated and confined and controlled so as to be to the everlasting glory and benefit of the communities in which it is controlled under that magnificent law. I should like to hear him detail it, I would like to know the provisions of it, I would like to know and see how it is that it would cause all communities to blossom out, where now rottenness exists, into beauty like the rose. I would like to vote for it. But I never yet have seen the man or heard the man portray its provisions and I never expect to, with all deference to the gentleman from Waterville.

"Success or failure," the gentleman said in regard to this law. It has been a failure, he said. Some other law might be a success. I grant, and everybody must admit, that so long as human appetite is depraved, just so long will there be violations of any law which undertakes to restrain or impair its exercises. But, Mr. Speaker, because the prohibitory law has not been an entire success, because it has not entirely overthrown and eradicated the drink habit, will you repeal it? You might as well and with equal emphasis say that the Christian religion ought to be abolished after a trial of 2000 years a few sinners still remain in Waterville. (Applause and laughter.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, candidly if the proposition to change the organic law of the State which is supposed to be as unchangeable as anything in our system of law, is to be adopted by us as the representatives of the people here, today, I will tell you frankly what I would like to see behind it. I would like to see, in the first place, the churches of the State of Maine; I would like to see the clergy, Protestant and Catholic; I would like to see the professors and presidents of our higher institutions of learning; I would like to see our educational institutions from one end of the State to the other take

an interest in the question. (Applause). I would like to see the Grangers of our State who represent at this time a very powerful influence, especially in our rural communities, for the up-building of morality and sobriety in society. I would like to see all the charitable institutions of the State behind it. I should then have no doubt that it represented something; my way would be clear; my action could be taken in the light and I should have no doubt which way my steps were tending. But, Mr. Speaker, I confess that I have scanned the petitions in vain. I do not find upon the petitions in favor of resubmission these elements that I say I would most gladly discover and which I certainly want to see fairly represented before I take that step.

I do not propose at this time to make any criticism upon any individuals or classes; I know that good men are in all parties and of all grades, all denominations, all kinds from high to low, from top to bottom of society, and take a different view upon this question and may have expressed themselves upon petitions and remonstrances. I assume that they have done it honestly and in accordance with the dictates of their judgment and conscience; and I at this time have not, like my friend from Waterville, any poor fellow to impale upon the sharp spear of my sarcastic eloquence because he may have made a slip in the heat of debate. I believe that every man here is acting conscientiously and fairly, and I have a right to assume that fact. As I said, my first reason for opposing this matter is fundamental, because I do not believe that the people ask for it or want it, and because I think the people have indicated their desires in another direction. They have said, if they have said anything to their servants in this State, "We ask for the enforcement of the law. That is what we expect you to stand for. That is what we stood for in the last election; that is what we expect you to stand for here." And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, disguise it as a gentleman will, you cannot rub out the fact that the people of this State are going to size up the verdict here, today,

upon this line. It is either resubmission for the purpose of securing a repeal of the prohibitory law and the enactment instead thereof of a high license law in this State and the free sale of liquor or it means standing by the law as it is, and you can talk to the country people as much as you please and you cannot get that idea out of their minds, and for a very good reason because it is the fact. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there are many good people in this State of Maine who do not believe for an instant that you can put out fire by throwing fuel upon it, of an inflammable character. They do not believe that if the great curse of liquor is that it is being drank and creating a thirst and a habit in the people to their ruin, that it can be stopped simply by opening wide the doors of the saloons upon the principal streets of our cities and inviting the public. That proposition is not believed by the common people in this State, and you cannot make them believe it. If the object of the law is to curtail, to put down, to stop the occasion of the habit, to stop the use of liquor, if that is the object of it, well and good. The prohibitory law has a tendency to do that. But no man believes and I do not care whether he is on one side or the other of this question, that making this thing more respectable, putting a high license if you please so it shall be for the express object of the liquor seller to sell all the liquor he can in order to get back his license fee and remunerate himself besides—you cannot make men believe that such a thing as that can tend to the suppression of the drinking habit in this State or in any other. It is contrary to common sense.

In discussing this matter, one gentleman, while he did not call any names, made the statement that all people who were opposed this proposition of resubmission were ignorant, prejudiced, bigoted and lived at the end of the road. In order to enforce the statement of the gentleman I ask your indulgence to read a word or two from a paper I hold in my hand.

"The deliberate adoption of this policy by a people naturally careful and conservative in their judgment was the inevitable result of a moral evolution

which recognized the demoralizing and far-reaching evils of intemperance, and sought to eradicate them from the community, and embodied the conviction that a traffic which took men from the ranks of productive industry, robbed them of their sober faculties, destroyed their self-respect and made them a burden and a menace to those who had a right to look upon them for support and protection—a traffic which filled the poorhouses, prisons and asylums with human wrecks, and imposed its greatest misery upon the innocent and helpless—was hostile to the public interests and wholly contrary to the spirit and purpose of a Christian civilization.

"Fifty years ago the so-called Maine law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors was placed upon our statute books, where it still remains. While it has not accomplished all its advocates and supporters hoped for, it has been a powerful force in the development and promotion of a healthy temperance sentiment among the people of our State.

"Today in a large majority of our country towns there exists practical prohibition, and the law against the liquor traffic is as well enforced as against other forms of crime. Even in our cities and larger villages, where the liquor interests are the most active and aggressive and where the law is the most persistently violated, it has not failed to exert a restraining and salutary influence, and it has been a power in stimulating and promoting that intelligent and vigorous public opinion which is the support of all effective law, and without which any legislative enactment must fall far short of its purpose."

The honorable gentleman from whom I have quoted is no less than His Excellency John F. Hill, who lives at the end of a road where many of us would be pleased to reside. (Laughter and applause).

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word more and I close. I have no set speech to make upon this question. I understand that many gentlemen desired to speak who could better voice the sentiments of the people of this State than any words of mine could do. But after having spoken thus briefly upon the fundamental idea

that I believe the people do not call for this thing and do not want it, but want the prohibitory law enforced and are starting out upon the idea of enforcement, I believe it would be the most foolish and most foolhardy and most suicidal thing we could do at this time to undertake to annul their verdict as given at the polls last fall by telling them that we are going back to some form of a license proposition without their asking for it and against their protest. I say it would be suicidal, and it will be suicidal for any party that undertakes that thing. Right here I wish to refer to the political aspect of the case. As the Honorable David B. Hill once said in a speech in a national convention, and which remark has become somewhat historic, "I am a Democrat." I stand here, today, to say that I am a Republican and have always been. That has no particular significance except in the fact of my pride in the traditions of that party I believe is well founded. I have seen it from my earliest days coming down through the last half of this century espousing and carrying forward every great, grand and noble work that has been brought forward by the different emergencies which have arisen, and I have seen it grandly and proudly carrying forward every time to completion every work that has been thrown upon its shoulders to do; and I hope that no such scarecrow as that which the gentleman from Waterville brings up here will deter any Republican from doing his duty in this matter. He says that it will disrupt the Republican party. He has given us six years of existence. (Laughter). I have to thank him for the last four; I did not suppose he would yield us but two. (Laughter and applause). It seems that while the gentleman may expect to be nominated next time, he really does not expect to be elected. (Laughter and applause.)

Speaking upon the political line for a moment, I want to say that this prohibitory law has not been hunting round very much for a father for the last 20 years—with all due deference to the gentleman from Waterville. In every platform which the Republican party has put out to its fellow citizens of the State of Maine for the last 20 years, there has been on unequivocal

plank upon this question and that party has been indorsed and re-indorsed elected, and re-elected; and the very last platform that our party put out contained a plank upon this very matter, and the people endorsed that. Where does the gentlemen get the light that he claims to see?

Mr. DAVIS of Waterville: Results.

Mr. LIBBY: Results? If I remember the result correctly the election went that way. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thing. It has been freely charged here that by the operation of this law which are said to have been so much of a failure that one gentleman said it amounted to a low license law and that was all—and I was thinking what in Heaven's name they had to kick about—if this was simply a low license law that they are having now and they were likely to get high license if they have it changed, why don't they let it remain as it is and be consistent about it? They will be jumping out of the frying pan into the fire, to use the vernacular of the kitchen—why not let it remain?

Mr. Speaker, we assume the responsibility in this matter, and when gentlemen charge that the enforcement or non-enforcement of the prohibitory law in this State has made a race of perjurers and liars and hypocrits, I want gentlemen to remember that that is a gun that it is well to fire at long range. It will do very well for men to shoot over the heads of those with whom they are in close connection and pass out such shots as that into the back woods and fields. It will be very well for a man to quote the Scripture that all men are liars, when it won't always do for him to turn around and tell his next neighbor that he is a liar. (Laughter and applause.) And when the gentleman takes the stump in his gubernatorial campaign two years from now, I hope he will have the good discretion not to get down too near and say to his audience, "You are a lot of hypocrits and liars and purjurers." That will do to pass out for the fellow in the next town or in the back lot, but when it gets down to too close range down below Mason's and Dixon's line, you know it is a cause for a person putting his hands in his breeches pock-

et. Those things will not go. It is not true, I believe, that those things are a libel upon the good character of the citizenship of this State, and I would far rather see gentlemen of such splendid tact and talent and ability and eloquence as these who are arguing upon that proposition, I would far rather see them using that ability and that talent and that eloquence in trying to build up the moral sentiment if the community against the drinking of intoxicating liquors and against the violation of this law and thus re-enforce it by their moral suasion. I tell you there is a broad field, there is a fertile field to be cultivated and men of such talent and such eloquence ought to be employed in it rather than in tearing down the safeguards which we already have.

Mr. Speaker, the political aspect of this case in my mind requires that we should stand firm as a party, I mean the Republican party, and give the people at least, so long as we have started out upon an era of enforcement, give them at least the time between one election and another, in order to see whether anything can be accomplished. Don't, the very moment after they have expressed their desire and their demand that there should be at least a trial of the prohibitory law by full, fair and rigid enforcement, don't say to them that they shall be shut off in the very first beginning of their demand. I say, then, give them at least the chance for a fair application of the enforcement of the prohibitory law. Then, as General Grant once said that the rigid enforcement of an unpopular law was the surest way in the world to secure its repeal, if it shall be found that it is unpopular and that there is a demand by the people for its repeal, I tell you, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, that the people of this State will make their views and their will known in such certain terms that you will have no occasion to doubt what it means. You will not be obliged when the people of this State have been fairly and wholly aroused upon any question, to have any doubt whether they want that question submitted to them for action or not. You will not be obliged to come here and back the question by a measly petition

of one out of ten against it. You will have something to show besides a sentiment that has been worked up, or attempted to be worked up and failed. The people of this State are not at a loss to know how to make their will known to their representatives; and I apprehend that you as representatives of the people, today, are not unmindful of what the will of the great mass of the people of this State is upon this question here. You are not frightened by any bug-bears of this kind that the gentleman from Waterville throws up. If the Republican party cannot stand by the plank in its platform upon this matter which it has reiterated again and again for the last generation, if it cannot at least stand up and be honest enough to stand upon its own platform, let it go down, is all the comment I make; but I want the gentleman from Waterville and every other man to understand that I believe that while there may have been an attempt to crystalize the Democratic vote of this House into a unit upon this question, when it comes to a question of crystallizing the Democratic vote of this State upon that unit, it will be a most miserable failure. I know of scores and scores of people of Democrats in the State of Maine who cannot and will not be wheedled into a proposition of that kind, no matter where their leaders go; and for every man that the Republican party loses for standing upon its platform and standing by its principles, two Democrats will come in to make up the loss, for I tell you this is not a political question. It is a moral question, and upon moral grounds the people of this State will decide it finally. The Republican party cannot afford to give down upon its principles, it cannot afford to give down upon the platform it has enunciated. Other parties may be able and willing to catch up any old hobby that comes along in order to secure a few votes, but the Republican party cannot afford to do it. We have turned down several propositions of that kind. The proposition of the greenbacker was turned down by us. The glittering doctrine of 16 to 1 was turned down by us. This proposition will be turned down by us and the same results will follow—we shall

go right along, conquering and to conquer, because we stand upon a rock and that rock the rock of eternal righteousness and justice, so far as this question is concerned.

I have only one thing to say in conclusion, and I would say it as Cromwell says: "Let all the ends thou aimest at be thy country's, thy God's and truth, and then, if thou fallest, Oh Cromwell, thou fallest a blessed martyr." (Applause).

Mr. THOMPSON of China: Mr. Speaker, Washington Irving, in writing the history of New York, prefaced his history by giving a description of the creation of the world. He claimed it as a necessary part of the history of New York, because, he reasoned, if the world had not been created, New York would not have existed, and consequently there would have been no history. In the able discussions of this question, both before the committee and in this House, it seems to me that we have covered a large field, and that much of the argument that has been made has not necessarily been pertinent to the question. The gentleman last speaking, it seems to me, has summed up from a practical standpoint the question at issue, this question of re-submission as it stands. It is impossible to separate this question, perhaps, from the questions of license and methods that have been so ably discussed; but the people of this State look upon the action of this Legislature, as he has suggested in this practical way, that the submission of this question means license in this State, that the turning down of this question means to retain the law as we have it; and while that may or may not necessarily follow, yet the people of the State in some way have that thought in their minds.

There is one phase of the question that has not been touched upon and it is the phase that I wish to refer to. The gentleman from Lewiston said that when the American Ice Company shall open business in a certain place, presumably somewhere in Androscoggin county (Laughter), that then, and not till then, would prohibition prohibit. He has evidently lost sight of the simple fact of evolution, of the fact that we are moving on and that this agita-

tion that is created among the people of the State on this question is the agitation that has troubled people of the past along the lines of all the great moral issues and questions that have come before them.

Daniel Webster in 1852, in Fanueil Hall, when the question of chattel slavery was under discussion, before the people of the United States, said that slavery had existed since the dawn of history and that it would exist when civilization was no more. Undoubtedly Daniel Webster made this same mistake, because it was under discussion and it had existed, that it would continue to exist. The 10 commandments here have been quoted as if they were the foundation rock of a starting point, something permanent and established. How do you think the 10 commandments were received by the people when Moses presented them? It was something new, it was a new commandment that had been given by the Lord to the people, and something that had not existed in the past, else they had not been given. It is a fact that this law perhaps is in advance of a certain amount of public sentiment along this line of morals, but do you know that in 100 years from now it will not be as it is today, there will be more of this liquor used or less. Nothing remains fixed. Is there any question in your minds in what direction we are moving. If you are to set this law back to license, why not go back to free rum? There seems to be one thing agreed upon by everybody who has spoken, and it is this, that the sale and use of intoxicating liquors is an injury to the individual and to the State. I have not heard that doubted. And admitting that premise, if we are progressing and advancing, is it not the natural outcome of this whole thing that we are going to move on until public sentiment does come up to this high standard of living, rather than to bring the law down to the low present standard of the so-called public sentiment? It looks to me, viewing it in the light of history, as though we are moving on in this line.

It is said that this sentiment comes from the backtowns. Yes, it does come

from the back towns. If you will remember, Christ was born in a small town, that all great moral reformers started from these small towns. You will find that all these great moral reformers start back in these centers and move toward the cities, and if the cities have any doubt in the State of Maine, that a demand for the enforcement of this law, is beginning to move that way they will soon find their mistake. I have been out in a few of these small towns in the State for the past two years, and it has been my privilege, probably, to know personally and see as many people in the State of Maine as any other person within the sound of my voice, not only people in the country but in the cities. I have heard the sentiment along this line expressed by individuals in their homes, on the street and in gatherings from a few hundred to a few thousand people, and if you could hear the applause whenever in the State of Maine in any town during the past two years, the speaker has referred to the enforcement of this law and the retention of this law, you would not doubt that there was a feeling for it. The gentleman says that the petitions which have come in here have been 10 to 1 in favor of retaining this law. Yes, and it might have been made 100 to 1. The great organization of the Grange has taken no active step in presenting these petitions, and why? Because we knew it was a dead issue, and that this was going to be turned down; and when they have referred to me I have said, "It is not necessary to waste your labor and energy in sending in petitions to this Legislature against resubmission." Why, resubmission—it was resubmitted last fall. Could anything be more strong than the plank put into the platform of the Republican party, and is there anything stronger than the voice of the people embodying that? It has been resubmitted; and when we speak of the referendum, certainly we should refer all questions to the people when there is a reasonable demand for it, but 1 per cent, or 5 per cent, or 10 per cent, on a question like this is not a reasonable demand to refer such a great question as this to the people.

I simply wish to say as a member of the committee, signing the majority report, that I hope the motion to adopt the minority report will not prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Speaker, I move when the vote is taken on this minority report it be by a yea and nay vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Cherryfield: Mr. Speaker, I only wish briefly to call the attention of the House to the significance and influence of the vote to be taken here, today, on this question. I recognize the fact that there are quite a number of citizens of this State, enlightened and good citizens, who believe that a high license law with local option would promote the cause of temperance better than the lax enforcement of a prohibitory law; and this matter of resubmission two years ago started with that idea, and it is looked upon throughout the State that this is the movement of men who prefer high license and local option to the prohibitory law, and that if this question is submitted, it will develop quite a strength in support of their position. Now, for men who take that position, to vote to accept the minority report in place of the majority report, they are consistent; but if there is a member of this House who believes in prohibition and in the enforcement of the prohibitory law, to vote to substitute the minority report or submit this question again to the people for the sake of, by an overwhelming majority, settling this question, I think his vote is lost for prohibition and strengthens the cause of high license. Because, as it has been stated, it is really a question between those who advocate high license with local option and those who believe in prohibition, and to vote no on this question means to vote for prohibition, and every friend of prohibition should vote no. (Applause.)

Now, we must recognize the fact that prohibition is making friends faster in the State of Maine, today, than at any time within the last 10 years. The temperance sentiment is increasing and county and state officials recognize the fact. The enforcement of the prohibitory law in the last few months along the Kennebec river in Waterville, Au-

gusta and Gardiner has decreased drunkenness and its resulting lawlessness to a noticeable extent, and the police officials so report. We have the prohibitory law on our statute books. It is bound by the constitution. Will the friends of prohibition let it loose in order to catch it again? If you have a ferocious beast bound with chains, would you loosen those chains so as to bind him again? The law is all right and I believe the era of its honest enforcement has begun. Let the friends of prohibition in this House today defeat by an increased majority the proposition of resubmission, which at the present time can only be consistently supported by believers in license law. Thus will you approve the present enforcement of the prohibitory law, strengthen the hands of our county officials and promote the cause of temperance. I believe that if today we turn down this measure by an increased majority over the vote of two years ago, we shall secure the matter for years to come. (Applause).

Mr. SWETT of Portland: When this resolution was referred to the committee on temperance, I stated that when the resolve should be reported to the house, I desired to offer some facts and figures bearing upon the question. I said that I believed that the prohibitory liquor law had been a detriment to the State both material and moral, and I propose to demonstrate that proposition. I do not intend to make any statement that is not supported by substantial evidence and if I fall short thereof, I will be pleased to have any member of the House correct and set me right.

In natural advantages for agriculture, manufactures and commerce, Maine surpasses all the states of the North Atlantic division, which includes Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Her area of 33,040 square miles just about equals the area of all the other New England states combined. Her area of fertile, cultivable land exceeds that of all of them, the county of Aroostook, alone, in this respect surpasses any one of them. The forests of Maine cover an area of

20,000 square miles, clothed with pine, spruce, hemlock, oak, maple, poplar, cedar and other valuable woods. We have more than 1500 lakes and ponds, covering 2300 square miles, and over 5000 rivers and streams, affording more than 2,500,000 horse power; more available water power than any equal area of the surface of the earth, not even excepting that of which Niagara is the center. The sea coast of Maine extending for 225 miles in an air line from Kittery Point to Quoddy Head is broken by the great bays of Casco, Narraguagus, Muscongus, Penobscot, Frenchman's, Passamaquoddy and numerous smaller ones forming a succession of long, rocky peninsulas, separated by deep and narrow inlets with many safe and commodious land locked harbors.

Maine has a longer line of navigable sea coast, with more accessible harbors than all the other states on the North Atlantic division combined. New Hampshire has no seaport accessible for the largest modern ships. Massachusetts has but one considerable port of entry, Boston; the long, sandy peninsula of Cape Cod which constitutes the largest part of her coast line having not a single harbor suitable for maritime commerce. Connecticut and Rhode Island have not a single first class ocean port. Aside from Long Island, which has not an available harbor, New York has not a mile of sea-coast outside of New York harbor; while New Jersey with 130 miles of ocean front from Sandy Hook to Cape May is a waste of sand beach without a single navigable harbor. In addition to her coast line, Maine possesses an advantage not enjoyed by any other State upon the Atlantic coast, in two great navigable rivers, the Penobscot 275 miles long, navigable for 55 miles to Bangor, and the Kennebec 155 miles long, navigable for 42 miles to Augusta, and many other rivers which at a comparatively small expense might be made available for maritime commerce.

In Portland harbor Maine has the finest seaport on the Atlantic coast, with great natural advantages of constantly increasing value, by reason of the steadily increasing draft and ton-

nage of sea-going vessels which are placing an embargo upon Boston, Montreal and other less accessible harbors. With these superior natural advantages, it is no wonder that the eyes of the early explorers turned to Maine as if by instinct, and that for 60 years, or until the blight of the prohibitory law fell upon her, she led all her competitors of the North Atlantic division in the ratio of her increase in population and development. The first census of the United States in 1790 found Maine with a population of 96,540. By the census of 1800 the population had increased to 151,719, a gain of more than 57 per cent., a larger percentage of gain than New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, or Pennsylvania.

In 1810 Maine's population reached 228,705, a gain of over 44 per cent., the largest gain of all the states of the North Atlantic division except New York. In 1820 she had reached a population of 298,269, a gain of over 30 per cent. and the largest gain of all her sister states except New York. Maine was then admitted to the Union, and with a just pride in her supremacy, our fathers chose for the great seal of the State, a shield charged with a mast pine tree, the largest and most useful of American pines, with a recumbent moose at its foot, denoting by his undisturbed position the extent of unsettled lands which future years might see the abode of successive generations of men, whose spirit of independence should be untamed and whose liberty should be unrestricted as that of the moose. They chose for its supporters, the farmer with his scythe; and the sailor resting on an anchor to indicate that the State is supported by these manly vocations. Over these they placed the North or guiding star and under it the proud motto, "Dirigo," "I lead." In 1830 Maine had a population of 399,455, a gain of over 100,000 in ten years, more than 33 per cent., and the largest per cent. of gain of all the states of the North Atlantic division except New York. In 1840 a gain of over 102,000, more than 25 per cent. and the largest gain of all her sister states except New York and Pennsylvania. In

1846 began the agitation in favor of the Maine liquor law, and in that decade the State made a gain of but 16 per cent. in population, being passed by all the states of the North Atlantic division except New Hampshire and Vermont. In 1852 the prohibitory liquor law was passed and during the decade to 1860 Maine gained less than 9 per cent. in population, the smallest gain of all the states of the Union except New Hampshire and Vermont.

Prohibition had now become the settled policy of the State, and from 1860 to 1870 Maine, for the first time in her history, showed a loss of 1364, the only State in the Union that suffered a loss in population, except New Hampshire, which following Maine's example had adopted prohibition in 1855. From 1870 to 1880 Maine gained in population less than four per cent., the lowest percentage of gain of all the states of the Union except Vermont.

From 1880 to 1890 Maine gained in population less than two per cent, the smallest gain of any state except Vermont, whose progress has been so slow that, compared with her sister states, she almost seems to go backward. From 1890 to 1900 during the decade of the most marvelous development in wealth and progress in the United States that the world has ever witnessed Maine has gained in population five per cent, the smallest gain of every state except Vermont, Nevada, and Kansas. The state of Kansas, the only prohibition state in the West, presents another striking illustration of the blighting effect of Prohibition, Kansas was admitted to the union, in 1861 with a population of 107,306, the most fertile state in the union, twice the size of Ohio, larger than all New England, about the size of Great Britain. In 30 years her population increased to 1,427,096, a gain of more than 1230 per cent. In 1890 the Prohibitionists and Populists got control of her, "Jeshurum waxed fat and kicked." They defeated John J. Ingalls, one of the most brilliant men that ever sat in the U. S. Senate, and they elected in his place a luxuriant growth of chin whiskers, raised by a Populist Prohibitionist by the name of Peffer. They adopted a prohibitory liquor amendment to the

state constitution and during the last decade from 1890 to 1900, Kansas from being the leading state in the great North Central division, has fallen to the rear end of the procession, and has gained but three per cent in population, including Mary Ellen Lease and Carrie Nation.

Mr. Speaker the figures of the United States Census show that during the first fifty years of her existence, or until she adopted the Prohibitory liquor law, Maine gained in population more than five hundred per cent. In this fifty years succeeding that, during the greatest era of progress in the world, she has gained less than twenty per cent the smallest gain of every State in the union except Vermont, I respectfully ask any member of this house who believes that prohibition is a good thing for Maine to explain these facts and figures.

Mr. Speaker,—I desire to briefly call attention to the condition of the farming interests of Maine under the prohibitory liquor law. I hold in my hand the official abstract of the last United States census of 1900. It states the value of farm land with improvements, including buildings, for 1880, 1890 and 1900, as follows:

	PROHIBITION STATES.		
	1880.	1890.	1900.
Maine,	\$102,357,615	\$98,567,130	\$96,502,150
New Hampshire,	75,834,389	66,162,600	70,124,360
Vermont,	109,346,010	80,427,490	83,071,620

Total, \$287,538,014 \$245,157,220 \$249,698,180

The figures show the loss in value of farm lands with improvements, including buildings, in the prohibition states since 1880, to be \$37,859,454.

I would like to have some of our Prohibition friends account for this result, to the farmers of Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the progress and development of manufacturers under license and prohibition. The census 1900 gives the value of the manufactured products of all the states, which is shown to be as follows for New England:

	PROHIBITION STATES.		
	1880.	1890.	1900.
Me.,	\$79,829,795	\$95,689,500	\$127,361,485
N. H.,	73,978,028	85,770,549	118,709,303
Vt.,	31,354,366	38,340,066	57,523,815
Total,	\$185,162,187	\$213,790,115	\$303,694,603

LICENSE STATES.

Mass.,	\$631,135,084	\$888,160,403	\$1,035,198,989
R. I.,	104,108,021	142,500,625	184,074,323
Conn.,	185,697,211	218,333,364	352,824,106

Total \$920,996,116 \$1,278,997,392 \$1,572,097,423

The figures show the increase in value of manufactured products during the past 20 years to be, for:

Maine,	\$47,531,692
New Hampshire,	44,731,280
Vermont,	20,269,449
Massachusetts,	404,063,705
Rhode Island,	79,910,707
Connecticut,	167,126,395

The total increase in the three Prohibition states being \$118,532,421; the increase in the three license states for the same period being \$651,101,307. Rhode Island with scarcely any water power, less than one-fifth of the size of Aroostook county, two-thirds the size of Oxford county, has gained more than Maine and New Hampshire combined. The increase in the three license states is five hundred and fifty per cent. greater than in the three prohibition states.

Ever since I was old enough to take an interest in politics, prohibition newspapers and prohibition speakers have used the savings bank statistics to bolster up the cause of prohibition. The condition of the savings banks in Maine, has been quoted year in and year out to prove that prohibition has largely increased the savings of the people of Maine. I was not surprised therefore, when at the recent hearing before the temperance committee, one of the speakers introduced the old stock fraud of the savings bank argument, with which they have deceived and deluded the people of Maine for the past thirty years.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after I received the honor of a seat in this House, I found upon my desk a copy of the statement of the able and accomplished bank examiner of Maine, made before the Taxation Committee of the last Legislature; the clearest, most concise and correct statement of the Mutual Savings banks of the United States ever published. The treasurer of the United States paid the bank examiner of Maine the high compliment of incorporating this statement in his last annual report. I read it with

great interest and on pages 32 and 33 I found a detailed statement of all the Mutual Savings banks in the United States which exposes the fallacy and falsity of the savings bank argument of the Prohibitionists.

Now Mr. Speaker Mutual Savings banks are largely a New England institution. Of 642 Mutual savings banks in the United States, all except 11 are in New England and the Middle states; 431 in New England and 200 in the Middle states.

I have taken Mr. Timberlake's figures, and from them, I have figured out the per capita of deposits by population in the six New England states. Any gentleman may verify my figures in ten minutes ciphering, and I find the per capita of deposits in the several states, taking them in the order of their amounts to be as follows:

Vermont,	\$71 54
Maine,	87 62
New Hampshire,	120 24
Rhode Island,	158 36
Massachusetts,	168 93
Connecticut,	171 69

Maine is the lowest of all the states except Vermont. The average per capita of deposits for the three prohibition states is \$93.31; the average for the license states is \$164.66 a difference of 176 per cent, in favor of the license states.

Mr. Speaker, I might go on almost indefinitely along this line to show that the prohibition has not contributed to the material prosperity of Maine, but I fear that I have trespassed on the patience of the House already. I stated my belief that prohibition had been a detriment to the morals of the State and I desire to call the attention of the house to that proposition.

THE MORAL RESULTS OF PROHIBITION.

Since I have been a member of this House I have talked with many of its members who have assured me that prohibition works well in their communities and I do not doubt that in many towns and villages it has produced good results. My experience of its working has been mostly limited to Portland, and others of the larger cities in their vicinities and I know that it does not produce good results in them.

I ask no member of this House nor anybody else to accept my opinion or assertions unless backed up by demonstrable facts, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am personally concerned, I would care but little if every drop of alcoholic liquor in the world were thrown into the sea and the method of its manufacture forever lost. I am not a member of any club or organization that dispenses liquor, I believe in temperance, and next to my family and friends, I love my native city of Portland, in my judgment the most beautiful city over which the American flag floats. I have visited every city in the United States that had as many as 25,000 of population up to the census of 1890, except Minneapolis and St. Paul, and I can recall none that for beauty of situation and surroundings, healthfulness and cleanliness approaches "that beautiful town that is seated by the sea" "leaning her back up against her hills with the tips of her toes in the ocean." My father and my grandfather were born there and died there; my wife and children were born there and to all who are nearest and dearest to me it is "the dearest spot on earth." I would that my arm should wither and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, ere I should stand upon this floor to advocate a measure that I thought would inure to its injury. I do not want to see saloons scattered along its beautiful streets or on its prominent corners, and least of all do I want to see the scenes that I have witnessed for the past two years under the prohibitory liquor law.

I reside in the heart of the business section of Portland, in the rear of one of its busiest blocks, in an old homestead that has stood there for 75 years, whose windows overlook the area where, every Sunday since this prohibition rage has denominated the city, I have seen young men from 16 and 17 years of age and upwards drinking from pocket flasks and what Sheriff Pearson denominated the "Sand peeps," which developed, increased and multiplied under his administration. I have compiled a statement from the municipal reports of every year since the enactment of the prohibitory law, showing the number of arrests for drunk-

eness in Portland for each year. I will not detain the House with the details, but will ask for its insertion in the record for the information of the House. It shows a marked increase in the amount of drunkenness under the prohibitory law.

Number of arrests for drunkenness in Portland each year from 1853 to 1902 as shown by city marshal's report:

Year.	Arrests.	Year.	Arrests.
1853	202	1878	1,603
1854	293	1879	1,469
1855	687	1880	1,219
1856	508	1881	1,455
1857	1,061	1882	1,351
1858	448	1883	1,453
1859		1884	1,455
1860	1,004	1885	1,090
1861		1886	1,142
1862	1,483	1887	1,501
1863	1,445	1888	1,363
1864	1,235	1889	1,230
1865	1,335	1890	1,211
1866	1,301	1891	917
1867	1,115	1892	574
1868	1,063	1893	1,464
1869	800	1894	1,750
1870	1,770	1895	1,807
1871	627	1896	1,756
1872	925	1897	1,691
1873	2,400	1898	1,740
1874	2,356	1899	1,548
1875	1,886	1900	1,464
1876	1,638	1901	1,165
1877	1,441	1902	1,593

I also submit herewith a table showing the ratio of the number of arrests for drunkenness to the population in 1853, and in each census year since and including the years 1901 and 1902. (I would state that I have deducted the population of Wards 8 and 9 for the years 1899-1900-1901 and 1902 for the reason that they are the recently annexed portions of the city, which have never had any saloons and are suburban residential sections where I am informed by the police authorities arrests for drunkenness are so few as to be unconsiderable.

Year.	No. of arrests.	Population of city	Ratio of arrests to population.
1853	202	22,815	1 to 112
1860	1,004	26,341	1 to 25
1870	1,770	31,813	1 to 17
1880	1,219	33,810	1 to 27
1890	1,796	36,425	1 to 20
1900	1,464	39,770	1 to 27
1901	1,165	40,120	1 to 34
1902	1,593	40,470	1 to 25

It shows that the ratio of arrests for drunkenness has increased from 1 to 112 of population in 1853 to 1 of every 25 of population in 1902.

By the official records, Mr. Speaker, I have shown how prohibition has affected drunkenness and intemperance in Portland. What has it accomplished in the entire State? I hold in my hand the Maine State prison report for 1902, which has recently been laid upon the desks of the members of this House. On the last page of their report, following the reports of the several jailors of the State, is the "Abstract of Jails" for the year 1902. A similar abstract is printed in all the reports of the inspectors of prisons and jails now on file in the State library, and I have compiled from those reports a statement of the number of commitments for drunkenness in all the jails of the State since 1881, and I desire to respectfully submit it as worthy of the consideration of the members of the House and of the people of Maine.

Table showing the number of commitments for drunkenness in all jails of Maine since 1881:

Year.	drunkenness.	Year.	for drunkenness.
1881	880	1892	1,717
1882	No report on file	1893	No report on file
1883	1,037	1894	2,308
1884	1,316	1895	2,614
1885	1,761	1896	3,049
1886	1,748	1897	3,063
1887	1,570	1898	2,967
1888	1,382	1899	2,901
1889	1,345	1900	3,259
1890	2,200	1901	2,851
1891	1,468	1902	3,193

The commitments for drunkenness last year show an increase of more than 350 per cent. since 1881.

I would also call attention to a comparison of the commitments for drunkenness in Cumberland county, where we have had most rigid enforcement during the past year, and in Penobscot county, where they have had practically high license. The report shows the number of commitments for drunkenness in Cumberland county to be 1067, or 1 for every 94 of population.

In Penobscot county the commitments for drunkenness are 366, or 1 for every 190 of population. A difference of over 100 per cent. in favor of Penobscot. Will some friend of prohibition explain those figures?

During Sheriff Pearson's first year the commitments of Cumberland county jail for drunkenness were 868.

During his second year and when the enforcement was much more effective they rose to 1067. I recently asked one of the most efficient and intelligent police officials of Portland, a man of more than 20 years' experience, how he accounted for that great increase, and he accounted for it in this way:

We have in Portland a large number of laboring men, men who do the hardest and most laborious work that is done in the city. They are men who work along the docks loading and unloading the foreign steamers, the New York and Boston steamers, the coasters that bring the great timbers of Southern pine, and the colliers, the coal barges and 4, 5 and 6-masted schooners that bring the coal to the coal pockets of the Boston & Maine Railroad, the Maine Central, the Grand Trunk and the great wholesale dealers who supply the retailers of the city and State. The coal heavers do what perhaps is the most laborious work done in the city. In the summer months they go down into the holds of the coal barges and schooners, where are the boilers of the engines, for every modern large schooner has an engine to do the hoisting, and those men work in competition with steam engines, shoveling the coal into the buckets, and when the sun is beating down upon the decks, the holds of these colliers are like ovens. Stripped to the waist with no clothing but a pair of overalls, these men work for five or six hours at a stretch till the noon whistle blows. They come out reeking with perspiration, their lungs and nostrils filled with coal dust, their bodies so black and begrimed that it is impossible to determine by looking at them whether they were originally white or black. Almighty God, (not having the wisdom and experience of modern prohibitionists to assist him), has implanted in man a craving for stimulants when he is exhausted, and after 6000 years of study and investigation by the greatest intellects of the world, medical science has not eliminated from its practice the divine injunction "Give strong drink unto him that perisheth."

Professor Valentin, the eminent physiologist, informs us that the

amount of watery vapor exhaled from the skin of a human being under normal conditions is 2½ pounds daily. A trainer of athletes can reduce the weight of a healthy man from five to ten pounds in one day by sweating him. We can in some degree imagine the physical condition of those coal-heavers when the noon whistle blows. When it was possible for those men to go to a beer saloon and have a couple of glasses of beer or go to their homes and have a bottle of cold, refreshing beer with their dinners, the craving for stimulant was satisfied, the thirst was quenched, the waste of energy supplied and the man returned to his work satisfied and contented. But nowadays, no beer can be had. Beer is bulky. Beer to be palatable must be iced and kept under prescribed conditions. A pint of prohibition whiskey can be manufactured from a half pint of alcohol with a little burnt sugar for coloring and may be stored in a manure heap indefinitely and will be no viler when taken out than when it was put in. Now, when the coal heaver comes from his work, there's no beer to be had, but there are plenty of pocket peddlers, loafers, "gutter-snipes" and "wharf rats," with pockets stored with prohibition whiskey. The coal heaver gets a drink or two of that. It burns his stomach, fires his blood, crazes his brain, his family and work are forgotten, he goes off and gets drunk, perhaps gets into a fight, is arrested, hauled before the court, fined from \$3 to \$5 with costs, or sent to jail and his family may beg or starve. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that is the way prohibition works in the city of Portland, and there sits my colleague who for years has been the largest employer of labor of that kind in our city, who will confirm this statement. Isn't it about time for the people of Maine, which for 50 years has been going from bad to worse under a system which has been tried and rejected by every Republican state in this Union, except New Hampshire and Kansas; to repudiate the leadership of a few fanatical women and a few irreverent blatherskites?

Mr. Speaker. I am opposed to the prohibitory law, because it is the pro-

lific mother of humbug, hypocrisy and false pretence, and never was that fact more strikingly illustrated than in this chamber at the hearing before the temperance committee of this Legislature. The opponents of resubmission were marshaled by the Joan of Arc of prohibition, the leader of the Amazons of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with the Rev. Wilbur F. Berry, the president of the Maine Wesleyan Seminary and College, to lead the assault. He took this floor, which he occupied solely through the courtesy of the members of this House, and like Saul of Tarsus "breathing out threatenings and slaughter," he denounced the members of this House and the Republican party. Turning in his place and pointing with threatening finger to the members of the House, he shouted: "I tell you politicians who listen at the key holes of saloons to ascertain public sentiment that the moral forces of this State have been fooled as long as they propose to be." He asserted that the Republican party has been cheating the prohibitionists for 20 years and that the time has come when they can be cheated no longer. Mr. Speaker, a single grasshopper will make more noise in a 10-acre lot than 10 yoke of quiet grazing oxen.

The grasshopper is endowed by nature with a peculiar attachment at the base of his extremities which by rubbing together he can produce that volume of sound which, on a summer's day might lead you to think that the world was full of grasshoppers, but the quiet grazing ox pays no attention to him until he gets in the way and becomes a nuisance, when the ox quietly sets his foot upon him and that grasshopper ceases to be a burden, and that is what will happen to Rev. Wilbur F. Berry, when he gets in the way of the Republican elephant. He has been one of the most prominent and loud-mouthed prohibitionists in Maine, and I propose to show this House how his practice squares with his preaching. A few years ago the Maine Wesleyan Seminary was in financial distress and its trustees applied to a wealthy and benevolent gentleman outside the State for relief. He generously endowed it with scholarships to the

amount of \$300 a year and was elected a member of the board of trustees in compliment therefor. What followed is recorded in history, and I quote from the columns of the Portland Daily Press of April 14, 1896, on file in the library of this building:

"Auburn, April 13, 1896, the sensation of the week at the Maine Methodist Conference held in this city was the debate, Monday forenoon, on the appointment of Hon. Frank Jones of Portsmouth, as one of the trustees of the Kent's Hill Seminary.

The discussion was begun by Rev. W. F. Holmes. Mr. Holmes said he didn't like to introduce the matter, but that he did it as a matter of duty.

The resolution was as follows:

Whereas, the recent action of the board of trustees of Maine Wesleyan Seminary and Female College has had the effect of compromising not only the seminary but also our common Methodism in their relation to the cause of temperance, thereby subjecting us to unfavorable comment and a painful humiliation, therefore,

Resolved, that we as a conference hereby express our regret at this action and earnestly hope it may be reconsidered.

The reading caused a sensation. Instantly half a dozen came to their feet. Rev. Mr. Randall hoped the brethren would withdraw the resolution; it was a blow aimed at the institution. If they passed the resolution he was sure the rest of the board of trustees would resign.

Rev. W. F. Berry favored indorsing the action of the trustees of the institution in the election aforesaid. Brother Berry scented the fleshpots of the Egyptians. Berry knew a good thing when he saw it. Brother Berry, as I will show you later on, had a good hand up his sleeve, and he was in the game for all there was in it.

Presiding Elder Corey improved the opportunity by presenting this:

Whereas, we have reliable information that a man, whose reputation has been in the highest degree inimical to the cause of temperance, has been elected a trustee of Maine Wesleyan Seminary, and whereas this action of

the trustees compromises not only the seminary, but our common Methodism in their relation to temperance reform, thereby subjecting us as Methodists not only to unfortunate criticism but also to a painful humiliation, therefore,

Resolved, that we, as a conference, express our entire disapproval of the action of the trustees and earnestly hope it may be reconsidered.

The Bishop—"And that's no better than the other. Both of them are vague. How am I to know from the reading of that resolution what they are driving at. I am not saying that I don't know" (applause). The bishop made further remarks about the vagueness of the document and Rev. Mr. Corey amended it to read: "a man whose reputation as a brewer," etc.

Before the question was put a dozen speeches were made. Rev. Dr. Gallagher said that he was not aware that the man in question had accepted the honor. He thought the attitude of this conference upon the temperance question was well known; he was quite sure the trustees of the institution would do only what was right and proper to be done.

Rev. Dr. Stackpole spoke in favor of the Corey resolution, amendment and ah. He said: "We must stand square on this matter. We don't want to indorse the action of the trustees of putting brewers on the board." (Great applause and shouts of "that's so.") I want all Maine to know how we stand. We don't want to cover up anything."

Rev. Mr. Holmes said: "Right here and now, we want to express our disappointment of this action of the trustees. It is going into the press; let's record our sentiments." (Applause greeted Mr. Holmes' remarks). Rev. Mr. Wood said: "I believe, brethren, that we should take money from any source. Take it where we can get it and consecrate it to God." This statement was received with hisses and shouts of "No! No!" and various forms of disapproval. Mr. Wood continued, but the noise and confusion were so great that he could not be heard. Then he climbed upon the seat and raising his voice louder than the average stump speaker, he proclaimed that he had said it once and he wanted to say

it again. He was greeted with a storm of hisses.

A patriarch of the conference: "Then you'd take money for the Lord's cause from the proprietor of a gambling hell?"

Mr. Wood: "Yes, sir, I would. I would take it and consecrate it to God."

Conference patriarch: "And may God have mercy on your soul."

Rev. H. E. Frohock of Biddeford, standing in the organ loft denounced the action of the trustees and indorsed the resolution. Elder Randall gained another audience and prayed the brethren to be careful how they upset things. This was greeted with cries of: "We know all about it." "Let unclean things be upset." "Turn them bottom side up." Rev. Geo. D. Lindsay of Portland introduced this resolution:

"Resolved, that as an annual conference we express regret that the trustees elected a brewer on the board of trustees of the Maine Wesleyan Seminary, and hope that the gentleman, so elected, may not be accepted." The resolution was not acted upon. Further discussion was held and finally the question was put. Rev. Mr. Corey's substitute resolution with the amendment was carried by a large majority, and the conference adjourned.

Now what do you suppose the trustees did when they received the resolutions of the conference? Did they all resign, as Elder Randall was so sure they would? Not one of them.

Do you suppose they returned his donation to the brewer and asked him to retire from the board? Not much, they simply threw the resolutions of the conference into the waste basket, "raked the pot," and "consecrated it to God."

When the conference met in the following year, Brother Munger introduced this resolution: "Whereas there has been elected as a member of the board of trustees of Maine Wesleyan Seminary a man whose business is condemned by the Methodist church and this conference, so that we as a conference cannot consistently maintain any relation to that institution, therefore Resolved, that we do not this year appoint visitors to the Maine Wesleyan

Seminary." Instantly Brother Berry was on his feet. He said: "I do not see what is to be gained by passing the resolution of Brother Munger. It will look as if we were pursuing this matter with a determined spirit. Let us bide our time and let the question settle itself. I move that Brother Munger's resolution be laid on the table." Then occurred considerable excitement and half a dozen members of the conference were on their feet at the same time demanding recognition by the chair. After considerable excitement the conference was polled on Brother Berry's motion to lay the resolution on the table and the motion prevailed by a vote of 41 yes, 10 no. The discussion still went on. Brother Holt got the floor and stated that if he were appointed a member of the board of visitors he would refuse to go, the only thing an honest man could do would be to decline. Brother Strout got the floor but was interrupted by an aged preacher named Bartlett, who had become greatly worked up over the question. He began to make a very impassioned speech. "You're out of order," said the presiding elder, "you can't speak now, someone else has the floor." "Maybe I be out of order," Mr. Bartlett went on, "but I can't sit still and say nothing. The Lord just puts the words in my mouth and they must come out." "Brother Bartlett," again said Mr. Luce, "you're out of order, you must sit down." "But I can't sit down," Brother Bartlett replied, "I must talk, I have words to say about this thing and I will say them and you can't stop me." He continued to talk while the presiding elder tried to make him sit down, and the members around him tried to make him hold his tongue. "You can't make me hold my tongue," he continued with much excitement. "I've got something to say and I must say it." It was fully 10 minutes before Mr. Bartlett had had his say. Then there was a running discussion for more than an hour, at the close of which Rev. Dr. Gallagher arose and announced his resignation as President of the college. He said that "he could not indorse the action of the trustees." He closed by saying: "You may act as your consciences may dictate, you

live up to your highest convictions and so do I," and this ended the discussion.

Now, mark the sequel. Last year the brewer died, leaving the institution \$10,000 in cash. Brother Berry has had himself elected president of the institution and now draws the stipend upon which he lives from the bounty of the brewer.

Oh, ye blind guides who strain at a glass of Jones' ale and swallow a whole brewery, brewer and all.

Mr. Speaker. The trustees of that college should erect on the highest summit of Kent's Hill a statue to commemorate the moral "sentiments" and "moral force" of Brother Berry, not of coarse grained granite, nor of dull cold marble, but of more appropriate monumental brass.

Mr. Speaker. I am well aware that any man or woman who ventures to oppose the views of prohibitionists will be the victim of slander and misrepresentation. When this resolution was before the House for reference I stated that prohibition was first tried in the garden of Eden and had proved a failure. In its next issue, the organ of the prohibitionists of Portland referred to me in these words, "was it quite politic in him, or kind to his allies in the movement against Prohibition in Maine, to intimate that their position upon a comparatively modern and local issue necessarily implies a disapproval of the prohibitions in the ancient and cosmopolitan decalogue? Mr. Swett should remember that that code is held in high respect by many who will work with him for the repeal of Prohibition in Maine."

In my remarks I made no reference to the decalogue. My words as taken down by the stenographer of the House and as printed in the Record were as follows:

Mr. Speaker. At a proper time and when the matter is properly before the House I desire to offer some facts and figures bearing upon this question. I don't believe in the prohibitory law. I believe that it has been a detriment to the advancement of the State of Maine, morally and materially. Prohibition was first tried in the Garden of Eden. As far as I am able to understand, it proved a failure there and has proved

a failure ever since. I do not propose to go into a discussion of the question at this time. My object in rising is merely to secure such a reference of this matter as may properly bring it before the House in due course of time that gentlemen may have an opportunity to present their views upon it."

That was what I said and all I said, yet the editor of the prohibition organ has printed in his editorial column this false and libelous statement.

"Representative Swett of this city favors resubmission because, as he says Prohibition, decalogue and all is a failure." Although his attention was promptly called to the libel, by the leading Republican paper of Portland, he has never had the fairness or decency to recall it, but has sent it broadcast in his paper which he claims has the largest circulation of any paper in Maine. The editor of another paper has devoted about two-thirds of a column to what he apparently thought to be a withering sarcasm in the course of which he says, "It matters not that Mr. Morrill, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Dingley, Mr. Frye and many others have expressed the opposite opinion; the statesman from Portland has views of his own." Well sir, he is right in that assumption, it matters not to my convictions that other men hold other opinions, any more than it matters to the editor that George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Munroe, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, William Henry Harrison, John Tyler, James K. Polk, Zachary Taylor, Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, James Buchanan, Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, Chester A. Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas B. Reed, Bishop Potter, Chas. W. Elliott, Seth Low and ninety-nine out of every hundred of the greatest and most illustrious Americans that ever lived were not prohibitionists and never believed in a prohibitory liquor law.

Take the "thousand immortals" the thousand greatest men who ever lived, can anyone name a prohibitionist among them? Go to the "Hall of Fame" that magnificent structure

erected on University Heights in New York City, in which are to be inscribed the names of Americans deemed the greatest in their respective fields; authors and editors, business men, educators, inventors, missionaries and explorers, philanthropists and reformers, preachers and theologians, scientists, engineers and architects, lawyers and judges, musicians, painters and sculptors, physicians and surgeons, rulers and statesmen, soldiers and sailors, distinguished men and women outside those classes; can you point to the name of a prohibitionist among them? Not one. If the prohibitionists have ever produced a single great intellect, they have hidden it under a bushel.

Mr. Speaker. Last October the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held its annual National Convention in Portland. It is reported to have been one of the largest and most successful conventions in the history of Portland. I attended several of its meetings and have read the reports of all of them which were printed at length in the newspapers of the day. The convention was held in the largest and finest theatre east of Boston, and in many respects was the most remarkable performance ever seen on that, or any other stage. The theatre was brilliant with electric lights and beautifully decorated with flags and streamers, the ladies were beautifully costumed and the cast included many veteran star performers. The program was interesting and amusing. There was a long address by the President and by Lady Henry Somerset, who had crossed the ocean from London to be present. There was singing and dialogues, gymnastics and calisthenics, there were many presentations of bouquets, much kissing among the sisters and much adulation of Lady Somerset who was taken down to the county building and had her intellectuals stimulated by seeing the sheriff pour a barrel of beer into the sewer. The American flag was tied to the British ensign with white ribbon amid great applause, there was a sort of pony circus, but the pony kicked over the traces and had to be led off. They had some imitation Indians and Uncle Sam in effigy, but he blundered in his lines and retired in

confusion. The children, grand children and great grand children of prominent prohibitionists were exhibited, and much applauded and the husband of the President of the W. C. T. U. made his first public appearance on any stage and bowed his acknowledgements; a modest unassuming gentleman. It is perhaps superfluous for me to say that he did not make a speech. Sheriff Dunn was brought on and exhibited a large collection of whiskey bottles, beer faucets and other trophies, and Deputy Sheriff the Rev. Henry T. Skillings made his appearance attired in a sort of tin breast plate or corset which he had seized from the person of some rumseller, who had worn it under his shirt to peddle rum from.

The lecturers of the W. C. T. U. made their reports and related their experiences at great length. One reported that she had ridden on a furniture van holding on to an upright in order to catch a train. Another had allowed herself to be billed as live stock to enable her to travel on a freight train and ride in the caboose. Another had traveled ten thousand miles addressed 134 meetings, five conventions, and had distributed thirty thousand tracts and leaflets; another had traveled over ten thousand miles, delivered 150 lectures and six sermons, spoken at five camp-meetings, and as she stated "would rather be in a prohibition fight than at a picnic any time." Another had traveled 10,324 miles, addressed 305 meetings, written 600 letters, and to quote the lady's own words "done about everything except performing the marriage ceremony."

Deputy Sheriff the Rev. Henry T. Skillings told the convention "that he was a total abstainer." He abstains not only from the use of intoxicating liquors but from non-intoxicating liquors as well. He had often declined offers of soda he said. He thought the example of an officer drinking soda at a fountain would be bad. He would not even drink a glass of water over a bar. He said: "I suppose I am what you would call a temperance crank."

The subject discussed by the convention covered a wide range. They discussed the trusts, the coal strike, and government ownership of coal mines.

One of the delegates thought they had better not turn the coal mines over to the government until they determined whether the U. S. government is trustworthy; they discussed the eight hour labor law, the army canteen question, and one of the sisters wanted a law to prevent a whist club in some town from calling itself the "White Ribbon Whist Club." The President solemnly announced that no woman had a right to wear white ribbon unless she had taken the total abstinence pledge. They discussed an amendment to the constitution prohibiting the use of tobacco, the regulation of the "Couchee Couchee" dances at the forthcoming Exposition at St. Louis, and they adopted a resolution requiring female figures on theatrical boards to be more modestly attired and wear higher corsets and longer pantalettes. All this and much more you may find recorded in the daily papers of Portland in the week of October 19, 1902, but if there was a single report from the W. C. T. U. of Portland or of any other town or city, recording the rescue of one drunkard or the relieving of distress in any drunkard's family or any practical womanly christian temperance work it escaped the pencils of the reporters.

Mr. Speaker. I am an adorer, a worshipper of our American women, our American girls, and in this at least do not infringe the decalogue; for there is nothing like them "in heaven above or earth beneath or waters under the earth. They are like themselves only. They have no rivals or compeeresses, in all God's wide and beautiful creation. Sir I have seen the women of many lands, and among them all, I have seen none that compare with my own fair country-women. The best blood of all races and climes commingles in their veins and they combine in themselves all that is brightest, noblest, best and most beautiful in the womanhood of all ages and nationalities. In them are blended all the fire of the Arabic maiden or matron, the exquisite taste of the French woman, the grace of the Spanish senorita, the poetic sentiment of the Italian, the industry and common sense of the German fraulein, the constancy of the Scotch lassie, the wit

and beauty of the Irish colleen, and the intelligence, dignity and purity of England's noble dames and damsels, with a freedom and dash and subtle resistless witchery that is wholly American. The combination is perfection. There is no God but Jehovah, and the American woman is his masterpiece. He had practiced on the women of a thousand races. He had produced Miriams and Judiths, Zenobias, Cornelias, Cleopatras, Catherines, Elizabeths and Marie Antoinettes. He had turned out Grecian maidens, Roman matrons, sirens, houris, heroines and goddesses, for nearly six thousand years of recorded time before he tried his hand on the American woman—and then, Creation welcomed its peerless crown jewel. Mr. Speaker, my ideals of womanhood may be somewhat old-fashioned, and not conformable to the modern new woman, who wants to go to caucuses and vote, or travel far and wide to lecture and expound prohibitory laws; but they are ideals which have come down to us through the ages, and have the sanction of some wise men. The wisest man that ever lived, has told us that "her price is far above rubies—the heart of her husband doth safely trust in her so that he shall have no need of spoil. She will do him good and not evil all the days of his life—She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands—She considereth a field and buyeth it; with the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard—She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff—She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy—She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness—She looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness—Her children rise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her. Give her of the fruit of her hands; and let her own works praise her in the gates."

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, can you believe for a moment that Abraham of old would have sent his servants and his camels, "laden with jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and fine raiment," to win the beauteous Rebecca

for a wife to his great and only son Isaac, if she had been a W. C. T. U. lecturer? Would the ideal love story of all history, sacred or profane, ancient or modern, which has come down to us through the ages, and which poetry and romance have as yet been unable to match—the story of the love of Jacob for Rachel—would it ever have been told if she had been a W. C. T. U. lecturer? Would Jacob have served his uncle Laban seven years for Rachel (seven years and the Bible tells us that "they seemed unto him but a few days for the love he had to her") if she had gone gallivanting round the country preaching prohibition?

Do you suppose that if Hero had been endowed with all the masculine, strident, leather lunged, power of speech of Mary Ellen Leese, or Carrie Nation, or Carrie Chapman Catt that Leander ever would have swam the Hellespont? No Sir! He would have waited for the last boat, and when he reached the house, he would have removed his shoes on the front door-step, stolen up stairs in his stockings and crept into his bed without waking her.

Mr. Speaker. The clergyman who spoke at the hearing before the temperance committee were not all prohibitionists, and among them was one who related an incident that happened in a restaurant in Portland where a table girl had suggested to him that she could furnish a bottle of beer with his dinner if he wanted it. Whereupon an ex-deputy liquor sheriff of Cumberland County Rev. Almon S. Bisbee, rose and said; if the gentleman will stay in Maine until the grand jury meets, I have no doubt that County attorney Whitehouse will be glad of his evidence in securing the indictment of the particular table-girl whom he mentioned." This from a professed disciple of him who when the woman "taken in the act" was brought to him that she might be condemned and stoned to death, said "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her."

In this connection I recall an item printed in the Boston Herald of January 18th.

Lewiston, Me., Jan. 17, 1903.

Two cases which were brought into

the municipal court by the special liquor deputies have attracted more than the usual amount of attention. One was a case where a warrant was secured to search the person of a woman, and in her clothing was found a bottle of beer. It is asserted that the bottle of beer which she had was left in the restaurant where she worked by two men who had taken supper there, and that the woman carried the beer to her room. The next morning she was awakened by the officers, who told her to open her door, and that they had come to make a search for liquors. The woman said she was frightened and not knowing what to do, concealed the beer in her clothes. The case was brought into the municipal court, and continued until Friday.

Are these the consummate flowers of chivalry and manhood in the State of Maine after fifty years of the prohibitory liquor law.

Mr. Speaker. I was brought up to believe that to a gentleman every woman is a lady by right of her sex, unless she chooses to unsex herself.

Almighty God implanted in the breast of every living creature that he made, the instinct to protect its females and its young.

There is no wild animal ranging the forest or the jungle; there is not a domestic beast, the meanest slave of man; there is not a reptile or an insect crawling upon the earth, that will not resist unto death the physical outrage of the female of its kind; and I don't believe that there is a band of barbarians wandering upon the face of the globe, and I know there is not under the flag of the United States, a tribe of savages so lost to human decency, that they would not drive from their tribal reservation any scurvy knave who under pretext of any form of law would commit such an outrage on a Digger Indian squaw.

There was another clergyman who appeared before that committee who also favored resubmission. I don't know who he was or whence he came. I have heard that he was a resident of this city. He certainly was a man of reverent mien and modest bearing, and in course of his remarks he took occasion to comment upon the noticeable falling off in the attendance upon

churches, and especially the attendance of men, and I thought that it might be accounted for in part by the fact that men who call themselves disciples of Christ are preaching, not the gospels of Saint Matthew, Saint Mark, Saint Luke and Saint John, but the gospels of Saint Wilbur F. Berry, Saint Charles S. Cummings and Saint Almon S. Bisbee.

Mr. Speaker. I am opposed to the prohibitory law because it shuts its eyes and passes by the rich and powerful and lays its iron hand upon the poor and weak. I ask the attention of this House to two companion pictures of its operation.

Two years ago there retired from the chair of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Maine, one who had adorned his office with as many of the qualities that entitle a man to the affection and esteem of his fellow-citizens, as any who has ever occupied that most exalted office in our State. A scholar, philosopher, patriot and statesman. He carried to his retirement that which should accompany old age.

"As honor, love, obedience, troops of friends."

It will be well for every member of this house, it will be well for you Mr. Speaker, it will be well for every official of our noble State, who shall carry to his retirement a tithe of the great honor that accompanied John A. Peters.

In honor of the occasion a banquet was given him by several hundred of the most distinguished officials and citizens of our State.

There were participating, the Governor of the State, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, United States Senators, Members of Congress, the Attorney General and Ex-Attorneys General of the State, and many other most distinguished of our fellow citizens, all prominent in the legal and business life of Maine.

I will read the bill of fare that was served. I desire to say that I am violating none of the proprieties in doing this, for it was a semi-public occasion and full particulars were published in all the leading papers of the State. Here is the bill of fare:

MENU:

Blue Points sur coquille.
Soup. Green turtle a la Anglaise.

	Radishes.	"Punch a-la-Romaine."	"Brandy sauce,"
Imperial Sherry.		"Brut Imperial,"	"Pommery Sec."
Lobster a la Newburg.		and Mumm's Extra Dry,	and those solitary breadsticks; I thought of Prince Henry's comment after reading Falstaff's bill at Boar's Head Tavern.
	Dressed tomatoes.		"Item, one quart of sack.
	Haut Sauterne.		Item, one capon.
Roast canvas-back duck.	Spiced jelly.		Item, one gallon of sack.
	Punch a la Romaine.	Rolls.	Item, one half pennysworth of bread."
	Mumm's Extra Dry.		"Oh! monstrous! but one half penny-worth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack."
Quail on toast.		Pommery Sec.	The reporter says:
Salads. Tomato and cucumber.	French dressing.	Toasted crackers.	"The toast master opened the assault by saying: 'My, friends, let me charge you that if you see what you want here tonight you are to take it—unless it is nailed to the tables. If you don't see what you want ask for it. If you don't get it the first time ask for it again, and again, and again, and keep on asking for it until you either get it or forget it and become happy in any case,' and then they fell to."
Neufchatel cheese.		Brut Imperial.	The music was in harmony and unison with the occasion. I will read the program:
Maraschino ice.	Brandy sauce.	Cakes.	"The Merry-Go-Round.
	Cafe noir.		The Singing Girl.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues of this house who like myself do not speak French, I will explain this royal repast somewhat in detail. I wish the Congress of the United States would submit an amendment to the Constitution requiring bills of fare to be printed in the United States vernacular instead of the hermaphrodite French which is now so prevalent in Yankee bills of fare, and which would often puzzle a Frenchman to translate.

"Blue Points sur coquille," I understand to be "Oysters in the Shell"; and these were washed down with "Imperial Sherry."

The next course was "Lobster-al-a-Newburg," "Dressed tomatoes" accompanied by "Haut Sauterne," then came "Roast canvas-back duck, Spiced jelly, Punch a-la-Romaine." For the benefit of the uninitiated, I will explain that "Punch a-la-Romaine," as I am informed, is a very subtle decoction of lemon juice, sugar, spices and Medford rum, frozen.

Not long ago I sat by the side of a Prohibitionist at a social supper where "Punch a-la-Romaine" was served. He ate two platefuls and declared that it was the best ice-cream he ever tasted. The canvas-back duck swam to its destination on a stream of "Mumm's Extra Dry." Then came "Quail on toast," and "Pommery Sec." "Salads, tomato and cucumber, French dressing. Toasted crackers, Neufchatel cheese and Brut Imperial" Maraschino ice, Brandy sauce, Cakes, Cafe noir."

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I have overlooked one item of the bill of fare. "Breadsticks." As I contemplated "Imperial Sherry," "Haut Sauterne,"

and concluding with the popular refrain, so appropriate to a company of lawyers, "When you Ain't Got No Money, you Needn't Come Round."

There sir, was a banquet worthy of the Supreme Court of any State in the Union. Worthy of the distinguished guest, worthy of his distinguished hosts, and I hope they all enjoyed it.

- As a companion piece for that delightful occasion I want to depict a scene which transpired a few weeks later and of which I was an eye witness. I was coming down Danforth street in Portland between twelve and one o'clock at noon and as I approached the corner of Centre street, known as Gorham's corner and which is the tenement house district of Portland, my attention was attracted by a large crowd gathered in front of a tenement-house. This section of our city is tenanted by

laboring men and their families, the street laborers, longshoremans and the poorer classes of our fellow-citizens, who live there, five, and six and sometimes more families under one roof. I stopped and asked a man who stood by, what was the cause of the excitement.

He said: "the sheriffs are searching for beer." Then I noticed a wagon backed up against the curb and on the seat was Deputy Sheriff Leach whom I slightly knew. In a few minutes Deputy Sheriff the Rev. Henry T. Skillings appeared with a case of beer in his arms, followed by a man begrimed and black with coal dust, evidently a coal heaver, who was vainly protesting against the seizure. The beer was placed in the wagon. Skillings mounted the seat and drove away, and the man or his wife were before the court the following day and received the due penalty of the law. And as I read the Court Records in the next day's paper I wondered if that coal heaver had ever read an account of the banquet of the Supreme Court and if so, what his opinion was of law and justice as exemplified in "the land of the free and the home of the brave," under the Maine Prohibitory Liquor Law. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the Supreme Court of Maine. They are a body of learned, accomplished jurists and gentlemen and an honor to their State. I voted for the increase in their salaries from a profound sense of duty and with much pleasure. No appropriation will pass this house, that in my humble judgment is more worthily bestowed. I want the judges of our courts to be able to live as befits their honorable position, and have champagne enough to enable them to sit with dignity and composure and keep their countenances while they impose fines of six hundred dollars or sentences of six months in jail upon the miserable devils who sell a glass of beer.

Mr. Speaker I have learned that virtue and temperance are not the peculiar prerogatives of any particular class of people; that they dwell as frequently in the humble homes of side streets as they do in mansions, avenues and boulevards; that they are clothed as frequently in calico prints, overalls and jumpers, as in silks, satins, broadcloth and fine linen, that they travel as fre-

quently, as fast and as far when shod with cowhide boots as when enclosed in patent leather, so they find as sure a haven in the breast of the poorest man who breaks his scanty loaf of daily bread as in that of the millionaire who carves his canvas-back duck, and that they thrive as well on beer and bologna sausage as they do on birds and burgundy.

I am glad to believe that notwithstanding the difficulties which prohibition places in the path of temperance, drunkenness is diminishing in this fair land of ours. Sobriety has become a practical necessity, and if people want to escape reproach, if they want to be included among the same, they must keep sober in the America of our time. In the early days of railroads most of the conductors came from the ranks of the old stage drivers. They were jovial good fellows who knew every mile of the road and everybody that traveled it. At the end of the day's run they were frequently to be found at a good hotel enjoying a social glass, and standing treat for any friend or patron of the road and such was the general custom throughout the country. Today you may travel the entire length of the Maine Central the Boston & Maine or any other well regulated road and you won't meet a conductor, engineer or trainman with the smell of liquor on his breath. Why? Because of the prohibitory law? No! Because the railroads of today demand the service of clear-headed, alert, bright men with all their wits about them, and every railroad man knows that drinking liquor means discharge without notice, and it is becoming so in every line of business. Men are learning that rum and business don't make an effective partnership.

Mr. Speaker.—Prohibition has never been a principle of the Republican party. No republican national convention ever recognized it. Every republican state in the union has experimented with prohibition liquor laws, everyone except Maine, New Hampshire and Kansas has rejected it and none has ever returned to it. Don't be afraid of the shadow of the ghost of the prohibition vote. No prohibitionist running as such has polled three per cent of the vote of Maine in fifty years.

What did they accomplish in 1880 when they ran for President Neal Dow, the man who for fifty years was the brains and backbone of the whole movement, the "grand old man" of prohibition.

I have no other words than those of respect for Gen. Neal Dow. He was a patriot and a soldier in the hour of his country's direst need, who, notwithstanding the fact that he had far outlived the age limit for military service, raised and led a gallant regiment of Maine's sons until the weight of years and wounds and suffering in rebel prisons forced his retirement. He was a man of strong convictions and of equal courage. None who knew him ever questioned the moral or physical courage of Neal Dow. He was a rare specimen of a well nigh extinct species; a conscientious, consistent prohibitionist. But he looked upon the temperance question just as a man may view a landscape through a bean-blower. He sees that which his bean-blower is pointed at and nothing else; and when Neal Dow contemplated the temperance question, his bean-blower comprehended prohibition only.

On the year in which he was a candidate the city of Portland cast 7,302 votes for President. How many votes for Neal Dow? One. The county of Cumberland cast 20,035 votes for President that year. How many for Neal Dow? One. The State of Maine cast 143,903 votes. How many for Neal Dow. Ninety-two. The United States cast 9,219,947 votes. How many for Neal Dow? Ten thousand three hundred and five. He received eleven one hundredths of one percent of the votes of the country. The Prohibitionists say they have no fear that the people of Maine, will repudiate prohibition.

Then why not submit the question to the people? Are you afraid to trust the conscience and intelligence of the people of Maine. They know that prohibition in Maine is doomed. They have heard from Vermont and they already read the handwriting on the wall in New Hampshire. If every member of this house who believes in his heart that prohibition is a humbug and a fraud will vote as he believes the minority report will pass this house.

At the battle of Chattanooga the

army of the Cumberland under Thomas faced the Confederate centre strongly entrenched upon the heights of Missionary Ridge. The fight had raged three days upon a line of battle ten miles long. On the right "Fighting Joe Hooker" with the old 11th and 12th Corps of the Army of the Potomac had charged above the clouds and carried Lookout Mountain. While on the left "Sherman's bulldogs" had set their teeth in Bragg's right flank, closing the door of his communications and barring it with the bayonets of the army of the Tennessee.

If Sherman could not be dislodged from his position, Bragg's hold upon Missionary Ridge could not be long maintained, and with desperate valor, again and again did Bragg's intrepid legions hurl themselves upon the indomitable veterans of Sherman. Broken and repulsed in every charge, Bragg used the dangerous manoeuvre of weakening his center to sustain his right. This was the move that Grant had watched and waited for and at once the order flew to Thomas to assault the center.

As the twenty thousand boys in blue rose to their feet and started on that desperate charge, the concentrated fire of shot and shell from thirty confederate cannon on the Ridge cut bloody lanes and highways through the column, but closing in from right and left steady as if upon parade the line swept on. As they reached the point-blank range of grape and canister, the deadly storm was doubled in its fury, the column bent and swayed and the lines curled and shriveled like dried leaves before a forest fire; but springing to the call of "colors to the front" they rallied to the charge and with a ringing cheer they surged into the first line of rifle-pits like tempest-driven waves on a storm-beaten shore. Before them rose the ridge, 500 yards in height, and as they breasted its fearful face, from two succeeding lines of rifle-pits, from rock and stump and bush the rebel rifemen rose up and poured into their faces a withering volley that clothed the hillside with a sheet of flame and as the white smoke of the musketry settled upon the face of the mountain, covering them as with a shroud and shutting them from the sight of Thomas and his staff on Orchard Knob; there broke from the lips of one of his young officers' the agonizing cry "They can't do it! They can't do it! They'll never reach the top!" But Thomas sitting there upon his horse, calm, cool and undismayed, the "Old rock of Chickamauga" raised his hand quietly and said "Time! Time gentlemen; give them time." And soon, above the surging smoke, they saw the gleaming lance heads of the colors; then breaking out like streakings of the morning light upon the hilltops, the red

white and blue of Old Glory, the line swept up, the crest was carried. Chattanooga was won, Kentucky and Tennessee were redeemed.

They were fighting a battle for freedom and enlightenment. So are you. And though their fight was fiercer and more dangerous than ours; they won it in due time, and so in the fullness of time shall we win this battle against humbug, hypocrisy and false pretence.

The question being to substitute the minority report for the majority report, the yeas and nays were ordered.

Yeas—Barker, Benner, Brewster, Burrill, Buzzell, Cameron, Carleton, Curtis, Daniels, Davis, Drew, Farnsworth (Pembroke), Gagnon, Haskell, Hayes, Irving, Kelley, Knowlton (Camden), Lamb, Little, Maybury, McIntire, McNamara, Pooler, Poor, Ross, Sewall, Shackford (Poland), Shaw, Spear, Stearns, Stover, Sutherland, Swett, Sweeney, Tartre, Thomas (Harpswell), Thompson (Orono), Thurlow, Tremblay.

Nays—Abbott, Albert, Bailey, Blake, Blanchard, Bodwell, Briggs, Buxton, Campbell, Clarke, (Nobleboro), Clark, (Prospect), Coburn, Cole, Cook, Davidson, Dilling, Dodge, Downing, Dudley, Eaton (Calais), Eaton, (Wells), Farnsworth (Tremont), Favour, Foss, Gannett, Gardner, Greenleaf, Hall, Hawkes, Hill, (Buxton), Hill, (Winterport), Howe, Hubbard, Jones, Josselyn, Knapp, Knowlton (New Portland), Leavitt, Libby (Mechanic Falls), Libby, (Newfield), Libby (Oakland), Littlefield, Manson, McFaul, McGregor, McKusick, Merriam, Mewer, Mills, Nash, Newcomb, Nickerson, Norton, Oakes (Auburn), Oakes (Milford), Page (Drew Pl.), Page (Skowhegan), Parrott, Patterson, Peaslee, Pettengill, Pike, Potter, Purinton, Putnam (Danforth), Putnam (Houlton), Randall, Reynolds, Ruggles, Sargent, Savage, Shackford (Harrington), Smith (Hartland), Smith (Madison), Smith (Presque Isle), Snowe, Sturgis, Tapley, Thomas (Topsham), Thompson, (China), Todd, Tripp, Twambly, Watson, Weatherbee, Wentworth, White, Williams.

Paired—Allen (Sanford) yes, Weeks, no; Boyd with Perkins, Butler with Waterhouse, Cordwell with Mead, Hinckley with Rice, Nelson with Low.

Absent—Allen (Wellington), Bussey, Furbish, Hill (Brownfield), Howes, Kimball, Morrison, Taylor, Thornton.

Yeas, 40; Nays, 80; Absent, 9; Paired, 12.
So the motion was lost.

On motion of Mr. Manson of Pittsfield, the majority report was accepted.

Mr. Davidson of Hammond plantation, introduced the following order and moved its passage:

Ordered, That 1000 copies of the legislative records containing the discussion on resubmission be printed for the members.

The order received a passage.

On motion of Mr. Sargent of Brewer, Adjourned.