

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-Second Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE.

1905.

HOUSE.

Friday, February 24, 1905.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Lawton of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

An act relating to the York Light and Heat Company. (Tabled for printing pending reference on motion of Mr. Nash of Kennebunk.)

Resolve providing for an epidemic or emergency fund.

An act to amend section 13 of chapter 128 of the Revised Statutes relating to malicious mischief.

Petition for repeal of section 25 of chapter 9 of the new Revision of the Statutes relating to manufacturing, mining and smelting corporations, referred in the House to the committee on legal affairs, comes from the Senate referred to the committee on taxation in non-concurrence.

The House receded and concurred with the Senate in its reference.

The following petitions, bills, etc., were presented and referred:

Judiciary.

By Mr. Hale of Portland: Petition of John H. Mitchell of Portland and 28 others in favor of initiative and referendum; petition of John S. Quinn and 28 others of Portland for same, endorsement of Barbers' Union of Portland for same.

By Mr. Gannett of Augusta: Remonstrance of the city council of the city of Augusta against the passage of the bill to abolish the common council of the city of Augusta and to make other changes in the charter; remonstrance of J. H. Chandler and 198 others citizens of Augusta against same.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Baxter of Portland: Petition of A. T. Laughlin and 34 others favoring a constitutional amendment providing for the taxation of wild lands; petition of Edward A. Noyes for same; petition of Archelaus Hunt and 12 others for same; petition of Owen Moore

& Company and 7 others for same; petition of H. S. Melcher and Company and 71 others for same; petition of Frank H. Haskell and 90 others for same; petition of Rines Brothers and 21 others for same.

By Mr. Jones of Searsmont: Petition of A. V. Martin and 12 others for same; petition of C. S. Adams and 9 others for same.

By Mr. Newbegin of Gray: Petition of Seth F. Sweetsir and 19 others for same.

By Mr. Oakes of Milford: Petition of A. E. Perry and 17 others for same.

By Mr. White of Levant: Petition of J. M. Goodwin and 14 others of Greenburn for same.

By Mr. Thurlough of Fort Fairfield: Petition of W. A. Harlow and others of Fort Fairfield for same.

By Mr. Weatherbee of Lincoln: Petition of J. A. Atwood and 33 others of Greenbush for same.

By Mr. Page of Appleton: Remonstrance of Follansbee & Wood and 40 others of Camden against the passage of any law intended to restrict or prevent the use of trading stamps.

By Mr. Cousins of Limington: Bill, an act to establish a commission to render a true and actual valuation on lands in places not incorporated for purposes of taxation.

By Mr. Goodwin of Sanford: Bill, an act to amend section 2 of chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes in relation to fees of trial justices in the trial of an issue in criminal cases.

Education.

By Mr. Kinsman of Cornville: Bill, an act to repeal chapter 623 of the private and special laws of 1893, and chapter 142 of the private and special laws of 1895, amendatory of said chapter 623, authorizing the town of Athens in the county of Somerset to expend a portion of its school money in Somerset Academy.

Agriculture.

By Mr. Dennison of Litchfield: Petition of M. H. Dustin and 29 others against repealing law for protection of robins.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Holmes of Caribou: Petition of P. S. Goud and 18 citizens of Arros-

took county for the enactment of a law prohibiting the throwing of sawmill refuse in Madawaska stream; petition of C. A. Ulrich and 49 citizens of New Sweden for same.

Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. Hanson of Machiasport: Remonstrance of Samuel Blunt and 39 others of Cutler against any change in the present lobster law.

By Mr. Whitmore of Brunswick: Remonstrance of Robert Jordan and 250 others against the passage of any act prohibiting the use of seines in the bays and harbors of the State.

By Mr. Nash of Damariscotta: Remonstrance of J. E. Nichols and 82 others against any change in the present law relating to purse and drag seines in waters west of Penobscot river; remonstrance of Ray Crocker and 71 others against same; remonstrance of H. F. Farr and 42 others against same.

Temperance.

By Mr. Tupper of Bangor: Petition of P. H. S. Vaughn and others for properly labelling proprietary medicines.

By Mr. Merrill of Skowhegan: Petition of W. H. Paine and 53 others of Skowhegan for same.

By Mr. Milliken of Island Falls: Petition of M. D. Estes and 49 others of Island Falls for same.

By Mr. Sparrow of Freedom: Petition of B. S. Hurd and 11 others of Thorndike for same.

By Mr. Baxter of Portland: Petition of George W. Way for same.

By Mr. Swain of Leeds: Petition of C. S. Stetson and 9 others of Greene for same.

By Mr. Poor of Belfast: Petition of Tom H. Sidelinger and 8 others of Belfast for same.

By Mr. Josselyn of Portland: Petition of D. J. Clough, M. D., of Portland for same.

Taxation.

By Mr. Purinton of Bowdoin: Petition of E. Fred Albee and 43 others for the repeal of section 25 of chapter nine of the Revised Statutes relating to manufacturing, mining and smelting corporations.

By Mr. Jones of Searsmont: Petition of J. M. Sukeforth and 15 others of South Montville for same.

By Mr. Copp of Cornish: Petition of Elmer E. Wadleigh and 14 others for same.

By Mr. Barrows of Newport: Petition of George A. Friend and 34 others of Etna for Grange bill to equalize school tax.

By Mr. Leonard of Milo: Petition of P. S. Hobbs and 43 others of Milo for same.

By Mr. Purinton of Bowdoin: Petition of J. T. Urskine and 42 others for same.

By Mr. White of Levant: Petition of E. A. Clark and 29 others of Levant for same.

By Mr. Page of Hampden: Petition of Blanche K. Blake and 16 others of Orrington for same.

By Mr. Thompson of Orono: Petition of E. H. Littlefield and 23 others of Orono for same.

By Mr. Jones of Searsmont: Petition of C. M. Howes and 15 others of South Montville for same.

Salaries.

By Mr. Blanchard of Blanchard: Petition of A. B. Eades and 27 others of Guilford for adoption of report of special committee for abolition of fee system; petition of G. B. Lyford and four others of Sebec for same; petition of T. F. Hobbs and 30 others of Milo for same.

By Mr. Nash of Damariscotta: Petition of J. H. Perkins and 62 others of Damariscotta for same.

By Mr. Page of Appleton: Petition of M. R. Stevens and 47 others of Knox county for same; petition of Robert S. Simmons and 67 others of Rockport for same; petition of W. W. Smith and 50 others of Rockport for same.

By Mr. Purinton of Bowdoin: Petition of Emery H. Gibbs and 48 others for same.

By Mr. Jones of Searsmont: Petition of C. M. Howes and 15 others of South Montville for same.

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Higgins from the committee on the judiciary to which was referred resolve to reimburse Herbert Kimball for

the amount of \$246.72 paid by him to the State for tax deeds, reported ought not to pass.

Mr. Higgins from same committee reported ought not to pass on resolve to reimburse Deforest Keyes the amount of \$24,304.34 paid by him to the State for tax deeds.

Mr. Powers from same committee reported ought not to pass on bill, an act giving an additional name to the Maine Congregational Charitable Society.

Mr. Higgins from same committee to which was referred the petition of Herbert L. Kimball praying that he be reimbursed \$246.72 paid by him to the State for tax deeds, reported that the petitioner have leave to withdraw.

Mr. Higgins from same committee to which was referred the petition of Deforest Keyes praying that he be reimbursed in the sum of \$657.48 paid by him to the State for tax deeds, reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Mr. Higgins from same committee to which was referred the petition of Deforest Keyes praying that he be reimbursed in the sum of \$23,646.85 paid by him to the State for tax deeds, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Russell from the committee on appropriations and financial affairs, reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of the Old Town hospital.

Mr. Morey from same committee, on order of the Legislature relating to compensation of the officers of the House, reported legislation inexpedient because the matter is already provided for by the Revised Statutes of Maine.

Mr. Johnson from same committee on resolve in favor of the Girls' Orphanage under the auspices of the Society of the Sisters of Charity of the city of Lewiston, reported that it be referred to the next Legislature.

On motion of Mr. Garcelon of Lewiston, the report was tabled pending acceptance, and Thursday of next week assigned for its consideration.

Mr. Tracy from the committee on legal affairs reported ought not to pass on bill, an act relating to the support of patients in hospitals.

Mr. Gray from same committee reported ought not to pass on bill, an act

relating to fencing of burying grounds.

Mr. Oakes from the committee on ways and bridges, reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of building bridge across the Thibadeau brook.

Mr. Oakes from same committee reported ought not to pass on resolve in favor of building a bridge across the Cyr brook.

Mr. Oakes from same committee reported ought not to pass on bill, an act to amend section 22 of chapter 128 of the Revised Statutes relating to obstructing traveled roads.

Mr. Baldwin from the committee on shore fisheries, to which was referred petition praying that a law be enacted prohibiting the use of seines or nets for the purpose of taking smelts or other fish in what is known as Back river, or Oven's mouth river, reported that the petition be reported to the next Legislature.

Mr. Irving from the committee on taxation, to which was referred petitions praying for an amendment to the constitution so that the rate of taxation upon wild lands may be changed, reported that they be referred to the committee on legal affairs.

Mr. Treworgy from the committee on shore fisheries, to which was referred petitions praying that a law may be enacted for a close time on lobsters of any size, under sufficient penalty, in the waters of Frenchman's Bay in Hancock county between the fifteenth day of July and the fifteenth day of September in each year, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Goodwin from the committee on ways and bridges, to which was referred petition for aid in building road in West Forks plantation, reported leave to withdraw.

Mr. Goodwin from same committee, to which was referred resolve in favor of building a highway bridge across the Kennebec river between the towns of Clinton and Fairfield, at or near Pishon's Ferry, so called, to connect the counties of Kennebec and Somerset, reported that the resolve be referred to the next Legislature.

Mr. Johnson, from the committee on judiciary, reported in a new draft bill, an act to amend section one of chapter

89 of the private and special laws of 1903 entitled, "An act to authorize the Penobscot Chemical Fibre Company to make, generate, use, transmit and sell electricity, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Newcomb from same committee reported in a new draft bill, an act to extend the charter of the Norridgewock bridge proprietors and to authorize the town of Norridgewock to take and purchase the property of the same, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Baxter from the committee on legal affairs, reported in a new draft bill, an act to amend the charter of the George A. Young Company, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Baxter from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to regulate the licensing of inn holders and victualers in the city of Portland.

Mr. Gray from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend chapter 75 of the special laws of 1866, as amended by chapter 18 of the private and special laws of 1878, entitled "An act creating the South Paris Village Corporation."

Mr. Oakes from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to amend an act entitled, "An act to incorporate the Phillips Village Corporation.

Mr. Oakes from same committee, reported in a new draft bill, an act granting additional powers to the Sebasticook Power Company, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Baxter from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, an act relating to the appointment of an inspector of milk and vinegar in the city of Portland.

Mr. Bunker from the committee on ways and bridges, reported in a new draft resolve in favor of aid in building a highway bridge across the Kennebec river between the towns of Bingham and Concord, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Oakes from same committee, reported in a new draft resolve in favor of repairing bridge across the St. Croix river near Squirrel Point in Baileyville, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Laliberte from the committee on State lands and State roads, reported

ought to pass on resolve in favor of the reestablishment where necessary of the boundaries of the lots reserved for public uses in the several plantations and unincorporated places.

Mr. Talpey from the committee on shore fisheries, on petition, reported bill, an act to amend section fifty of chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the alewives fishery in Penaquid river, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Laliberte from the committee on State lands and State roads, reported in a new draft bill, an act in relation to the lands reserved for public uses in the plantation of Pleasant Ridge, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Laliberte from same committee, reported ought to pass on resolve to aid in building road in Eagle Lake Plantation.

Mr. Sargent from the committee on education, reported ought to pass on resolve in favor of Castine Normal school.

Mr. Briggs from same committee, reported in a new draft bill, an act to amend chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the education of youth and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Laliberte from the committee on State lands and State roads, reported ought to pass on resolve authorizing the land agent to sell certain public lots in St. Francis plantation in Aroostook county.

Mr. Baldwin from the committee on snore fisheries, reported ought to pass on bill, an act authorizing the codification of the sea and shore fishery laws.

Mr. Kinsman from the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition in favor of closing Marsh river in Waldo county, and its tributaries, for two years from May 1st, 1905, reported that the same be referred to the commissioners on inland fisheries and game.

Mr. Kinsman from same committee, on petition reported bill, an act to prohibit ice fishing in lake Narragausus or Spring lake, so called, in Hancock county.

Mr. Baxter from the committee on legal affairs, reported ought to pass on bill, an act authorizing the construction and maintenance of a wharf in the

tide waters of Casco bay in the town of Falmouth.

Mr. Kinsman from the committee on inland fisheries and game, reported ought to pass on bill, an act to regulate fishing in South Boundary pond, Little Northwest pond, and Massachusetts Bog in the county of Franklin.

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

First Reading of Printed Bills.

An act to regulate the sale of milk and cream.

An act to authorize Joseph Long to build and maintain a toll bridge for foot passengers across St. John river at or near Fort Kent, and to build and maintain piers and abutments for supporting said bridge.

An act to amend section 1 of chapter 274 of the private and special laws of 1901.

Mr. Sargent of Brewer offered amendment "A," by adding to the title of the bill the words "relating to the maintenance of piers and booms on the St. John river in the town of Grand Isle."

The amendment was adopted and the bill received its two readings and was assigned for Monday afternoon for its third reading.

An act granting Belonie Hebert and Sons the right to erect and maintain piers and booms on the Saint John river in the town of Madawaska.

An act to regulate the sale of imitation dairy products.

An act regulating the duties of the commissioner of agriculture relating to the manufacture and sale of dairy products and their imitations.

An act to authorize the Sebec Lake Lumber Company, its successors and assigns, to maintain a wharf and boom in Sebec lake.

An act to amend section 25 of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the relief of poor debtors.

An act to incorporate the Farmington Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

An act to incorporate the president and trustees of the Farmington Home for Aged People.

An act to amend chapter 242 of the

private and special laws of 1895, entitled "An act to incorporate the city of South Portland."

An act relating to the prevention, control and extinguishment of forest fires in plantations and unorganized townships.

An act to enlarge the corporate rights of the Piscataquis Woolen Company to do electric lighting.

An act to abolish the common council and increase the membership of the board of aldermen of the city of Portland. (Tabled pending first reading on motion of Mr. Hale of Portland, and Thursday of next week assigned for its consideration.)

Resolve in favor of Harry B. Conway.

Mr. SEWALL of Bath: Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolve lie on the table, and I will state my reason. It is a pension bill providing for a pension from the State of Maine. There has been an unusually large number of those bills that have come in here at this session, and every one but this has been accompanied by a statement of facts.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was tabled pending its second reading.

Resolve in favor of Miss Fannie L. Jenkins for State aid. (Tabled pending second reading on motion of Mr. Sewall.)

Passed to be Engrossed.

An act to extend the charter of the Caratunk Power Company.

An act to provide for recording of condemnation proceedings.

An act to incorporate the Messalonskee Electric Company.

Mr. JOHNSON of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment to this bill, and in support of the amendment I will say that the Act provides that the Messalonskee Electric Company may acquire the plants, property, franchises, rights, privileges and locations of other corporations or individuals doing business in the same territory. It does not seem to me that the court could possibly construe the word "acquire" so broadly as to give the right to take by eminent domain, but those interested in the matter have felt that the words "by purchase"

should be added after the word "acquire." That is the purpose of the amendment. I move to amend by inserting after the word "acquire" in the first line of Section 4, the words "by purchase."

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

An act to legalize the doings of the town of Masardis in the county of Aroostook.

An act to organize the plantation of Portage Lake.

An act authorizing and ratifying the construction and maintenance of a wharf from Macnorth or Macket's Island, so called, into the tide waters of Casco Bay, in the town of Falmouth, Maine.

An act additional to Section 12 of Chapter 107 of the Revised Statutes relating to easements.

An act to enable the Sebago Lake, Songo river and Bay of Naples Steamboat Co. to construct and maintain a wharf at the foot of Long Lake in the town of Naples and county of Cumberland.

Resolve in favor of Mathias A. Cullan of Belfast.

Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act to amend section four of chapter 88 of the Revised Statutes, relating to service upon co-partners in trustee process.

An Act to prevent throwing refuse and garbage into the Aroostook river within the limits of Fort Fairfield Village Corporation.

An Act to authorize Skowhegan Hall Association to issue preferred stock.

An Act to amend section 9 of Chapter 81 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of Deputy Clerk of Courts.

An Act to extend the rights, powers and privileges of the Brownville and Williamsburg Water Company.

An Act authorizing the Crosby Mercantile Company, and the Crosby Lumber Company to consolidate.

An Act to amend section 10 of Chapter 98 of the Revised Statutes, relating to replevin bond.

An Act to amend Chapter 279 of the

Private and Special Laws of 1901, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Matagamon Manufacturing Company."

An Act to increase the capital stock of the Skowhegan Hall Association.

An Act to authorize the town of Skowhegan to subscribe to the capital stock of Skowhegan Hall Association.

An Act to enable the Clinton Electric Light and Power Company to issue bonds.

An Act amending section 76 of Chapter 9, of the Revised Statutes, relating to the abatement of taxes.

An Act in addition to Chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the sale of land for taxes.

An Act to incorporate the Peaks Island Gas Company.

Finally Passed.

Resolve in favor of the Maine Home for friendless boys.

Resolve to provide for deficiencies in appropriations for the schooling of children in unorganized townships.

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School.

Resolve in favor of the Knox County General Hospital comes from the Senate with House Amendment A rejected and amended by Senate Amendment A.

Mr. Kimball of Rockland, moved that the House recede and concur with the Senate in the rejection of House Amendment A.

Mr. Johnson of Halowell, moved that the House concur with the Senate in the adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Mr. Higgins of Limerick, asked to have the amendments read.

Mr. KIMBALL of Rockland: I can explain to the gentleman from Limerick. The original resolve as passed by the finance committee carried \$1500 for the years 1905 and 1906. I introduced an amendment to that resolve asking for two thousand dollars for the years 1905 and 1906, and one thousand dollars additional for maintenance and repairs. That amendment was passed in the House and tabled in the Senate. The Senate, this morning, has voted to non-concur on the House amendment and has adopted a new amendment to the original bill which carries one thousand dollars for maintenance and repairs

and leaving the \$1500 for the year 1905 and 1906 as it originally stood.

Mr. SWETT of Portland: I would like to say a word before that vote is taken. The committee on appropriations and financial affairs, as every member of the House knows, has had, as it always has, more calls, more worthy calls, than it was able to respond to. That matter was very carefully considered by the committee and it was thought that we were doing all that the State was able to do in granting their first request. This is not the only deserving case by any means that we have been called upon to turn down and I hope the House will adhere to its original action and not increase the amount of the appropriation. I want to say to the House that it has been the policy of the appropriations committee all through, agreed upon in advance, that we should adhere to our original opinions. If we changed them or admitted any exception or reductions we should precipitate the entire Maine Legislature into such a conflict of financial confusion that it would prolong the session of this House and vastly increase the expenses of the State.

I don't know that I can add anything more to what I have said, but if we take such action as is here proposed we shall certainly complicate all our affairs and many schemes which have already been favorably acted upon will come back here and there will be no end to the confusion that will ensue.

Mr. KIMBALL of Rockland: Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the exact standing of this resolve. When this matter came up for a hearing before the finance committee the Knox County General hospital was present with a number of witnesses. A portion of the witnesses were called before the committee. At the request and definite statement of the House chairman of that committee (Mr. Swett of Portland), I was told that it was not necessary to introduce any more witnesses and that I would receive what I was asking for in that committee. Whether the House chairman had authority to make that statement or not I do not know; but I did not introduce the rest of my witnesses. After a consultation with the members of the committee, with

the senator from Aroostook, Mr. Putnam, who is the chairman of the committee, at their request an amendment was added. That first amendment passed the House and was tabled in the Senate. I have since conferred with the finance committee, nearly every one of them, and I think the House chairman (Mr. Swett) is the only gentleman with whom I have not conferred, and the Senate amendment as adopted in the Senate, introduced by the senator from Washington county (Mr. Pike) who is the second member of the finance committee and with the consent of the committee and with the understanding of the committee, was supposed to be without any opposition. Therefore, gentlemen, I am not attempting to slide anything by this committee, but I simply ask that this resolve be passed as it is satisfactory to the committee, as is shown by the motion made by the gentleman from Hallowell, (Mr. Johnson), this morning.

Mr. SWETT: I have had a talk with the chairman of the committee and I was under a little misapprehension in regard to it: and I wish to withdraw what I may have said in opposition to the amendment.

The question being on concurring with the Senate in the rejection of House Amendment A, the amendment was rejected.

The question then being on the adoption of Senate amendment A.

Mr. JOHNSON of Hallowell: I wish to say for the benefit of the members of the House that this Senate amendment A was agreed upon in the committee in executive session, yesterday and the amendment was drawn by the Senate committee of the finance committee of which I am a member and as the resolve now stands with the amendment A of the Senate attached to it, it is thoroughly satisfactory to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs and I move that it be adopted.

The motion was agreed to and Senate amendment A was adopted.

At this point a visiting delegation from the Massachusetts Legislature, consisting of former residents of Maine, entered the hall.

Mr. BUZZELL of Old Town: Mr. Speaker, we have with us this morning 24 honored sons of the commonwealth of Massachusetts. They were all born in the good old State of Maine and have come down at the present time to make this body a short visit. In behalf of the members of this House I extend to them a most hearty welcome; and, Mr. Speaker, in honor of the event I move that the House take a recess until 11 30 o'clock.

The SPEAKER: The Chair takes the liberty to announce that I believe I voice the sentiment of the entire House when I say that we are pleased and feel honored that the natives of the State of Maine, wherever they may wander and whatever successes they may attain in any part of our country always have the longing to come back to their native land; and I can assure you, gentlemen, that the latch string is always out; I give you a hearty welcome and I should be pleased to have you meet personally every member of the House. (Applause).

The question being on the motion to take a recess until 11.30 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

After Recess.

Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Hastings of Bethel, the rules were suspended and that gentleman introduced bill, An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes in relation to bowling alleys and pool rooms, also bill, An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes in regard to inn holders and victuallers, and on further motion by Mr. Hastings the bills were referred to the committee on legal affairs.

Special Assignments.

Special assignment: Report of the Committee on Railroads and Expresses, reporting on Bill, In relation to fares upon Washington County Railway, "ought not to pass, legislation being inexpedient at the present time."

The question being on the adoption of the report "ought not to pass," the report was adopted.

Re-submission.

Special assignment: Majority and

minority reports of the Committee on Temperance, reporting "ought not to pass" and "ought to pass," on Resolve, in favor of the resubmission of Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of Maine, relative to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Lewiston: Mr. Speaker and members of the House, as a member of the temperance committee and standing here as I do now to move for the substitution of the minority report for that of the majority on the question of the resubmission of the fifth amendment to the constitution relative to the prohibitory law, I realize the fact that I shall meet with an opposition bolstered up by arguments which have long since lost whatever little weight they may have had. I am cognizant of the fact when any proposed legislation such as this is up as a matter for discussion, that there will be some sincere in their opposition, while there will be many others who in their opposition will become intoxicated with the exuberance of their own verbosity and practice a rhetorical deception upon an unthinking public in their advocacy of the prohibitory law. It is not my intention, and neither is it my desire, to enter into any discussion at this time as to whether or not there is more or less drunkenness in this State at the present time than there was 10, 20 or 30 years ago. I do not propose to enter into any discussion as to the relative advantages of a prohibitory over a license law, nor vice versa. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, to take advantage of the grand opportunity furnished us by the party preference law set up in the Oakes caucus act, to refute the statement or argument which has many times been made that those who are opposed to the prohibitory law are those who have at heart the interests of the liquor traffic. Suffice it on that point to say that a careful examination of check lists furnished by the city and town clerks of this commonwealth for caucus purposes, if a comparison be made between the names marked "Republican" on those check lists with the names upon which United States revenue stamps have been issued from Portsmouth, any fair-minded gentleman will be satisfied that those men who have been and who are today engaged in the liquor traffic in this commonwealth are not members of the political

party to which the minority members of this House belong.

I do not intend in the brief time I ask you to bear with me, to enter into any statistical discussion as to the number of arrests, prosecutions or anything of that sort. Two years ago, upon this same floor, then as now the polished literateur of this House, the cultured and scholarly gentleman from Portland (Mr. Swett) presented a discourse here which refuted any and all of the fallacious arguments that had been set up by those people who claim that a prohibitory law is a panacea for all the resultant evils of the habit of intemperance coupled with all the interests of those of the liquor traffic, and I say that that eloquent, that scholarly, that masterly and that able refutation of those arguments is a matter of record; it is a part of the record of the last Legislature; it is on file, so that any man, woman or child seeking any response to any such argument may find in that the knowledge which they desire.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the fact that in each and every man there is a natural, inherent right that man may eat that which he wishes. There is the same right that man may drink that which he wishes. There is no law which forbids man to eat that which he does not desire; much less is there any law which forbids man to drink anything other than that which he wishes. There never has been in this State nor in any other state in the Union, any attempt to pass any such law, for the simple and sole reason that you cannot by law compel man to eat or drink that which he does not desire. In the hearing which was given in this hall on the question of resubmission some few weeks ago, there was some opposition to this matter beautifully delusive and highly colored word pictures of the benefit of prohibition. Now, gentlemen, I ask you that you give to those remonstrances, not the benefit of your sympathy, but rather that you consider the means, the visible means of livelihood, of the very persons making that opposition; and having done that, gentleman, I ask you to liberate yourselves from the thralldom of party allegiance, to disregard the necessity which may be advanced as an argument to you for a prolongation of this legalized farce in order that the dominant party may continue to be successful at the polls. I ask you also not

to give to those feminine pleadings the benefit of your sympathy; but I ask you as business men, as practical men, acquainted with the conditions of the world, to remember that it was the ill-advised plea of a woman and the response to it by the first man that brought man to sin and condemnation.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that in this debate for the substitution of the minority for the majority report there may be some opposition. I am cognizant of that fact, but I say to you, consider the real vital question as it appears here. It is not a question of whether or not under some other form of law we would have better or we would have worse conditions than we have today or than we would have under the most rigid enforcement of a prohibitory law together with all its attendant allurements for vice and the sacrifice of virtue and honor. I ask you, members of the House, to consider the real burning issue in this question, and that is, whether or not you shall say to the voters, to the people of Maine, that they have the right to pass judgment upon resubmission; whether or not you shall hearken to the demand which is made upon you at the present time, or whether you shall ridicule and put to scorn the judgment of your constituents; and I submit, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that the judgment of our constituents is even better than that of the members of this Legislature, as was evidenced by the fact that they sent us here to labor for three months, and on top of that with an almost unanimous verdict that our time and our ability were worth but the paltry pittance of \$150, while they remained at home secure in the management of their own affairs, and conscious of the thought that the actions of past Legislatures upon this question has been sufficient evidence for the issuance to the members, of those Legislatures at least, of commitment papers to the expensive institution across the placid Kennebec.

I anticipate the argument that since the law against arson, burglary and larceny is broken, we must expect the prohibitory law to be infringed. But there is no semi-universal inherent tendency in man to burn, steal or rob. Those tendencies are criminal and have been so adjudged by Him who is the first and greatest of law makers.

I realize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in this discussion some people will advance the argument that if there is re-submission there is an increased and added expense. Why, gentlemen, we have heard from the mouths of those same men whom I would expect to advance that argument, the most eloquent defence, the most highly polished tributes to the gentleman who and the institution which for years past has done the printing of this State at an annual cost to the citizens which makes the salaries of potentates and rulers of the old world appear but a mere bagatelle in comparison. I anticipate also, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that the argument may be advanced that there is today a greater demand than ever for the enforcement of the prohibitory law. I ask in all candor, in all justice, and in every spirit of fairness, whence does that voice for enforcement come? Does the dominant party read the writing on the wall? I will be answered that the present incumbent, His Excellency Governor Cobb, was elected upon a platform which promised enforcement; but I say to those gentlemen who would advance that argument, can they in the same breath account for the fact how out of 16 candidates for the shrievalty offices in this commonwealth six of them standing upon a platform which had pledged itself to resubmit the fifth amendment, were elected to their offices? I also anticipate the argument that the people of this State have already voted upon this question. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, I admit that years ago they voted to adopt this amendment; but, my friends, consider the vast strides and advancement that have been made in 20 years. In that time a whole generation has passed into eternity; another generation has grown from youth to manhood, and another and a larger generation has been brought into being. At that time we were a union of some 30 odd states. Today, if my memory serves me, we have some 46. Consider the advances that have been made in science, in art and in literature. We have, for example, the wonderful Marconi, the man who with his wonderful genius has manipulated the sound waves and made possible wireless telegraphy. Yes, my friends, we have grown from a little union of 30 odd states in the past 20 years until today we stand here having cast aside the farewell address of Washington, disregarded all the

principles enunciated in the Munroe doctrine, and unmindful of the advice and judgment of that Gibraltar of American ideals, that Herculean defender of American institutions, the product of our own State, Thomas B. Reed, we have acquired the Philippine islands, and having acquired them we have paid for the inhabitants thereof at the rate of \$2 per head in order that the American soldier might have an opportunity to demonstrate the inefficacy of the "water cure."

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate another argument, but I say here and now that the superficial evidence of a necessity for an Oakes bill, the superficial evidence of the necessity for a Sturgis bill, is the very best argument that could be made here or any place else in favor of the re-submission of this important question. They say to us that if this question is re-submitted they know what the verdict will be. But why, my friends, do they cling so tenaciously, why do they fear to re-submit it? Where is the necessity of an Oakes bill if all the promissory notes which have been issued by the Republican party in the last 25 years on this question have not gone to protest? I say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact of an admission from the members of the majority party that there is a necessity for any such legislation is the very best argument that can be adduced here in favor of re-submission. I say in reply to those who are trying to explain away the election of six sheriffs who are members of the majority party, I say to them, here and now, that there is not in any one of those six counties a sufficient Democratic vote to elect a Democratic sheriff. And the fact that a Democratic sheriff has been elected in those six counties is absolute and undeniable proof that there must have been many Republicans who voted that ticket. And why did they vote it in view of the fact that the candidate for Governor stood firmly upon a platform which promised strict enforcement? I will tell you. While they wished to keep the guide of the Republican party, while they wished to elect the head of the ticket, they concluded that was the most emphatic method of disapproval which they could place upon the un-

kept promises of the majority party which have been forced upon them in Republican State conventions for the last 30 years.

I anticipate the argument also that I will be asked who are the petitioners for re-submission, where are your signatures? Gentlemen, you know that petitions are always regarded in this light by a committee—if you have them they are not worth anything, and if you do not have them they are the first things they request. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, that the most emphatic form of a petition that can be issued relative to the wishes of the people upon such an important question as this were the nearly 50,600 Democratic votes which on September last were placed in the ballot box for a candidate for Governor who stood upon a platform which promised that the people should say whether or not this question would remain upon the statute books. There are our petitions, the petitions of nearly 50,000 voters, not women or children, but voters, men interested in the best welfare of the commonwealth, men who have no interest in the liquor business, men who look only for the advancement and the best methods of uplifting their fellow men. There I say, are the petitions of those who favor re-submission, and you must admit that those are petitions which were unsolicited, that it was an honest expression of the opinion of the men depositing them, and consequently the most emphatic kind of a petition that can be presented in favor of legislation for any cause.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, that the one great objection that will be advanced here is that there is no necessity for this re-submission. These people who oppose it are satisfied as to what the effect and result of a vote upon this question would be. If you are satisfied I say to you, members of the House, that it is your bounden duty to hearken to the voice of those nearly 50,000 voters which was so forcibly expressed at the September election. I say to every man here who is opposed to re-submission that if he conscientiously favors the

Sturgis bill then he should vote for re-submission, because if the prohibitory law was a success there would not be any necessity today, for a Sturgis bill. I say to those people who are opposed to the Sturgis bill, the members of this body who do not believe in the Sturgis bill, I say to you that if you do not believe in it then you are men who believe in the use of liquor, and consequently you should give to every one of your fellow men the right to say whether or not he will be allowed to purchase it as a citizen or be compelled to buy it like a criminal.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have no fear of the result if this question is resubmitted to the people. I am never afraid to trust the people. I believe that if this question were resubmitted to the people they would settle it and settle it in the manner they believe to be right. I have confidence in the people of this State to do that; and I have confidence in them for this reason, that that virtue, if I may so call it, confidence, is the real corner stone upon which this grand Republic of today has been built. Away back in the early centuries a little group migrated from Holland to the stern rock-bound coast of Massachusetts. What was the cause of their coming? It was simply due to the fact that they had confidence in themselves as people to legislate and enact laws that would be for the best interests and the better developments and the uplifting and the education of each and every member of the community. We might go on and trace the development of the American nation from the time of the Pilgrim Fathers all down through the years to the present time. You will find, my friends, that any great change which has been made in legislation, any great improvement which has been made has been accomplished because the promoters of it were intelligent and they were willing to trust in the confidence of the American people. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, that it was confidence in the American people which forced the O'Briens, if I may allude to that family, the O'Briens of Machias when they sailed out there from our own coast and captured the British ship Margueretta, and by so doing served notice upon the world that a revolution had actually begun. It was confidence

in the American people that encouraged the writer of the great Declaration of Independence. It was confidence in the American people that prompted the composition of our grand declaration of rights. It was confidence in the American people—and we are all Americans who live here in the commonwealth of Maine—it was confidence in them, for example, that made Warren the leader at Bunker Hill which history shows him to have been. It was confidence in the American people which induced that great American, Webster, to stand on the floor of the national Congress and utter the thoughts of a mind that was like a mighty loom weaving tapestries of glory for each and every citizen of the American commonwealth. It was confidence in the American people that animated the poetical genius of our own Maine poet when he wrote the beautiful "Ship of State." It was confidence in the American people that encouraged Sam Houston at Santa Anna, Andrew Jackson at New Orleans; it was confidence in the American people that gave the present ruler of this nation the spirit to go before the people in the last election as the radical member of his party, upsetting all the tenets of the national Republican machinery which had been in existence for years, and made him willing to place his cause before the American people on such a platform, and in return receiving the greatest tribute from the common people of this country that was ever given to any candidate for office. So I say, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, that all those examples, and I might cull many more from the pages of history if time permitted, that all those examples of what confidence in the people of a free American liberal form of government such as we have, can accomplish—with that knowledge, with those facts staring us in the face, I say to the members of this House, resubmit your fifth amendment to the voters and allow them to say whether or not it shall longer remain on the statute books, whether or not we shall continue in the future as we have in the past 20 years to help create a rum-stocracy here in the good old commonwealth of Maine.

I move you, Mr. Speaker, that when the vote upon this question is taken that it be taken by the ayes and nays.

Mr. HOWES of Palmyra: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: It is

strange to me that we have persons in our State and even in our midst who are still living more than 2600 years in the past and who do even realize the fulfillment of the prophet Isaiah, but who are still revelling with the "drunkards of Ephriam whose glorious beauty is a fading flower."

On the one side stand in solid array every rum seller and rum guzzler; every law breaking citizen, criminals of every rank seeking the destruction of the home, bring poverty and sickness into every community and desolation upon every side. Led by the same evil spirit that caused the downfall of man in the Garden of Eden.

On the other hand stands earth's angelic host as portrayed by the church with its thousands of members. The home with its sacred environments and invincible family altar, every mother in the State of Maine, she who guards her children from the wayward snares of youthful days to that goal eternal and everlasting is there. Many of the most important business interests are centered here, all the elements of society for virtue and morally are here arrayed. We are greeted by the same omnipotent hand that brought the children of Israel out of the land of bondage into the promised land. We are led by the Divine power that direct the affairs of men and nations through all the ages. We have just listened to eloquent remarks in behalf of every distillery, wholesale and retail liquor dealer in the United States; a brilliant plea for the open saloons as they now exist under the glorified Portland plan and as they have existed in recent times in other parts of the State; a touching supplication informing us of the beneficent qualities of the Maine rum-seller and rum guzzler, in fact, gentlemen, such a feeling entreaty that the harsh countenance of His Statanic Majesty is wreathed in smiles, yea, it beams with joy in the knowledge that his cohorts have such becoming qualities and such able lieutenants. In truth we have heard audacious arguments in behalf of Devil and Hell itself. We have been asked to license Perdition in its most veritable state here in our very midst. But you may search if you will, through all the laws both written

and unwritten, from the Mosaic law down to the present time and you will not find a single statement by which you can legalize wrong. And what does the prosecution present as witnesses. They present us the united support of every wholesale and retail liquor dealer in the United States, of every rum-seller and rum guzzler in the State of Maine. They offer only one petition of 61 names for re-submission. They present to us the Bangor rum convention which was the greatest gathering of outlaws that ever assembled within the four walls of any building in Maine outside of the Maine State prison. They also present to us political corruption as it has undoubtedly existed in some of our cities for we have absolute proof that three different breweries contributed \$1000 each as a corruption fund to defeat the Republican sheriff of Androscoggin. They also offer for our consideration the re-submission plank of the silver-lined, doubled gold-plated platform of the Maine Democratic party.

The defence in turn, the temperance interests, present to you the church with all its high influences, with its high influences, with its high ideals; they present you with the schools with their teachers and educators. They present also to temperance organizations, the W. C. T. U., the Good Templars and the Civic League; and especially would I mention the W. C. T. U. The charge was preferred against them that they did not enter these low positions and seek out the drunkards as in days gone by. That may be. But how many of my re-submission friends have ever gone down into the depths of Hell and there stood by an erring brother and sung to him that song, "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me let me hide myself in Thee." Not one of them, I don't think; And yet the president of the National W. C. T. U. has done so as she testified in our presence. We were also told at the hearing before our committee the other day that the labor organizations of our state were arrayed against the free rum movement. The home which is and which has been the foundation of this Republic stands solidly against it; and we are asked to sell the birthright of free-

dom, of equal rights, the birthright that was fought for and maintained in the days of the revolution and also in the days of 1812, and later in the days of 1861 to 1865—that birthright that is so sacred to every loyal American heart. Another organization that is destined to be of great influence in Maine legislation, the Grangers, 45,000 strong stand opposed to re-submission and free rum. Again the railroads and the insurance companies have made it their policy, especially among their employes, that they should be non-partakers of intoxicating liquors.

Again, a good deal has been said in regard to the Republican party. I am glad to say that I belong to that party and I heartily indorse the Republican plank that was adopted at the Bangor convention last June; and that is the plank which we indorse here today. Every woman in the State of Maine stands fast against re-submission; and when you have that you have a backing of no little importance. Hundreds of petitions have come to us this winter, and upon those petitions are no less than 5000 signatures. Maine's leading men such as Neal Dow, Pearson and Dingley, whose life work has been accomplished and who have been called yonder were leaders upon our side; and Frye and Littlefield and Dunn and Mrs. Stevens and many others are carrying on the work that the fallen leaders have laid down. It is a glorious blending of the radiant gems of the past with the bright and sparkling gems of the present. These witnesses that I present to you are unimpeachable and their testimony is unquestioned. I ask you if it is possible that the life work of Neal Dow avails nothing, that the sacrificed life of Sheriff Pearson avails nothing in our midst, and is it possible that no lessons are drawn from the works of these men?

We have been told today that prohibition does not prohibit. There is not a law upon the statute books but that is violated, even the fish and game laws where we have so many special wardens to enforce them, yet those laws are violated. And so it is with every law, State as well as National. And how can it prohibit when an official candidate openly defies it? Tell me,

if prohibition does not prohibit, how many of you who are officials or candidates for positions, how many times have you gone to the prosecuting officers and given them evidence of its violation, when at the same time you come down here and tell us that the prohibitory law is violated. We are told that six Democratic sheriffs have been elected; it is true, but I call it simply a Democratic misfortune. Mr. Speaker, I would say that if re-submission must come, we will be prepared for it, and we will bring to the support of the prohibitory that 40,000 strong, and we will bury the re-submissionists and the free rum ideas deeper than on the 8th day of last November; and, Mr. Speaker, I move that when the vote is taken it be taken by the ayes and nays.

Mr. MERRILL of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I did not intend to say anything upon this question, today, but it is too important a matter to us as representatives of our several districts, and too important a matter to the State of Maine, to let it go by without one word from me. I feel that it is one of the most important questions that has been, will be or can be brought to the attention of this Legislature. What does the minority report ask? It asks that we and the majority of the committee, who represent the majority of the voters in the State of Maine, go back on the promises we solemnly made in our convention and which every man who went out upon the stump to speak to the people of this State on the issues of the campaign, promised to them that we would perform when assembled in this House this winter. Our Governor nominated, our officials nominated by the Republican party, went upon the stump and told the people that they would carry out when they came to this hall the principles laid down in that platform; and every mother and every sister throughout the length and breadth of this State, today, sends up her pleading voice that we vote against this most iniquitous proposition of re-submission. I say, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, when the gentleman who comes in here in support of

the minority report, refers back to our ancient ancestor in the garden of Eden and attributes to her all the evils that have come down through the centuries to mankind, and when he refers to the petitioners 5000 strong, to the best of mothers, the best of fathers, the best of sisters and sweethearts in our great commonwealth, asking us to vote against re-submission—when he undertakes to say that it is the weak and pusillanimous plea of the women, the sex that caused Adam to fall in the garden of Eden—Oh, my dear friend from Lewiston, the son of a good mother, in the name of high Heaven never again, so long as you live, refer to the women of the good old State of Maine as not being capable of being good judges upon the great moral question involved in this proposition. (Applause.)

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the hour is late; but we have a committee on temperance and that committee has returned their decision after a full and careful hearing upon the question; and I move you, sir, that the report of the majority of that committee be sustained by this House. (Applause.)

Mr. MILLIKEN of Island Falls: I have no desire to make any speech, Mr. Speaker; as an individual it would be my preference to keep still. I have the honor, however, to represent what I believe to be the strongest temperance section of the strongest temperance county in this State, and in view of what has been said I want to say one word. As I say, my section is a temperance section and the temperance people of this State are opposed to re-submission; but I think the discussion of this question has wandered somewhat from the real issue. I think no one questions the truth of my statement when I say that any person or any party who proposes to this Legislature the re-submission of any part of the constitution of this State should establish two propositions,—first, that the people of the State have not recently had an opportunity to vote upon the question; and second, that there is at the present time a demand among the people for the re-submission of the question. Now, ap-

ply that to the question of the re-submission of the prohibitory law; and without discussing the merits of the temperance question, and without going into that, no one will say I think, no one will believe that those who favor the re-submission of the temperance law have established or have tried to establish either of those propositions. Neither of them is true.

The people have had a chance to say what they think of the temperance law, and I think their verdict is unquestioned. They do not demand that the law should be re-submitted; in fact, where any opinion has been expressed by petitions it has been in opposition to it.

Mr. HUTCHINS of Penobscot: Mr. Speaker, what is the question now before this House for discussion— It is not as to whether we shall add another law—created in the heat and hurry of this already rapidly passing session—to our already burdened statute book.

Not this—but is a question of far more transcendent importance. It is the question as to whether or not we shall practically recommend to the people of this State to tear from our State constitution the prohibitory amendment, which has stood in some form as the settled policy of this State for a half century.

We may well pause on the threshold of a discussion which contemplates such a movement.

During the 86 years since the adoption of the constitution some 30 amendments have been added to it, and every step in the construction of that instrument has been in the line of progressive legislation and for the second time in the history of the State has initial steps been taken to repeal any part of the embodied will of the people. Our Legislatures have from time to time adopted many experimental and ill-considered measures that have been quickly condemned by the people, and subsequently repealed by the Legislature; but every element that has been added to our constitution has become solidified into enduring law.

History demonstrates that the great fundamental laws of a people should be free from perpetual tinkering and the shifting sands of a fickle disturbing element.

The constitution of Maine provides that two-thirds of the House and Senate, if necessary, may submit an amendment to the constitution to the people. What necessity has arisen which practically asks for a repeal of the prohibitory amendment?

Are the people demanding re-submission? Not much. A few feeble petitions have struggled in here only to be drowned by a flood of remonstrances.

The question of re-submission came before the last Legislature backed by more than 2000 petitioners, and opposed by 35,-

000 remonstrators. The question was ably argued on both sides and went down in defeat.

The friends of re-submission were so utterly dissatisfied that they started a missionary campaign over the State for the purpose of organizing re-submission clubs. They called a great re-submission convention in the beautiful and sympathetic city of Bangor which was addressed by the three great apostles of re-submission. They boldly stated their purposes and views and further declared that the next Legislature of Maine—this honorable body—would be elected on the re-submission issue, regardless of party. But the results of that re-submission aid, so glaringly inaugurated, were never made public, and the voice of re-submission died away as calmly and quietly as a stirring breeze sinks to rest in the bosom of night.

One of those distinguished defenders of re-submission, alias license, who had been repeatedly honored by his city, suddenly sprang into fresh prominence as the Republican re-submission candidate for Governor; but he was so utterly and sadly defeated in the convention that his own city forgot to vote for him.

Not intimidated by this new political development, the Republican party went boldly into the campaign with a break, a protest in its ranks against extravagance, but it stood out squarely for prohibition and against re-submission, and what was the result? Why, it rolled up a majority of 26,000 votes, against internal odds, in one of the hardest fought campaigns that ever took place in the State of Maine.

We thought the question of re-submission was pretty well settled for a while, and when my friends from Lewiston presented the resolve a flurry of surprise passed over us, and we thought probably he had a vast resource of undeveloped strength behind him and that he would be borne up on a sea of petitions. But he comes in here without the evidences of public sentiment, as a lawyer goes into court—without evidence, knowing that his well-constructed, forceful plea will convince the jury.

Now what's the matter with the prohibitory law? What great necessity for a change exists today? We have the strongest law for the suppression of the rum traffic that stands on the statute books of any state in the American Union. If enforced in the spirit and letter it is amply sufficient to wipe out the last vestige of the rum traffic in the State in less than a year's time.

It stands there today as the embodied indictment of the people of Maine against the most damnable curse that ever threatened the civilization of a noble people. It stands there as the expression of our hopes and ideals, touching a problem that is taxing the statesmen and philanthropists of nearly every civilization under the sun. Do we want to hold in our hands the most effective weapon ever conceived by the ingenuity of man to crush the most powerful evil that ever confronted an intelligent people, and hold it there until we have strength and courage and skill to wield it in its full force.

or shall we abandon the results of nearly a hundred years of agitation and education on the question of temperance and relapse into weakness, debauchery, misery and ruin? Do you want a law that will make this whole miserable business legally respectable and place it among the honorable occupations, surrounded and protected by the holy sanction of the State, against the wishes of the saving elements of citizenship and with the frown of the Almighty shadowing our State? There isn't a man in my presence today who has a son or a daughter—I care not what his attitude on the temperance question is—who desires the State to teach in gilded letters the lesson that intemperance is a virtue and rum selling an honorable business.

Not for 25 years, at last, has there been so much strong, wholesome sentiment in favor of a live, active prohibitory law.

Public sentiment is the life of law. The tide is rising. Let us hold our grip and wisely carry forward the work so happily begun. We can't have perfect laws and a perfect enforcement and never shall have until the people have reached a state of perfect moral development. But it is a hopeful sign when we have laws that reflect the best sentiment of the best people even if their practical operation is hindered and neutralized in a measure by the worst elements of society.

Some sensitive politicians tell us we must take this troublesome question out of politics. You never can.

The Republican party has lashed itself to the prohibitory law and with it, it must rise or fall. Shall the Republican party exist only to furnish food for a few hungry politicians? What distinctive feature marks its character today except as the champion of prohibitory legislation that has attracted the attention of the civilized world? What better, nobler service can it render a state than by fighting down an evil that has not a single redeeming apology for its existence, that brings nothing of good to a people, and that leaves nothing but poverty, misery and ruin in its train?

Ever since I have been qualified to cast a vote my political fortunes have been with the Republican party. I have looked on it with pride as the best embodiment of the progressive tendencies of civilization in government, and cherished its history as a precious legacy. But I had rather sever my connection forever with that party if it should prove recreant to its duty and to the solemn pledges which it has made to the people. (Applause).

Mr. HIGGINS of Limerick: Mr. Speaker, I move that the pending question be postponed for next Tuesday for the order of the day at that time. I do this because there are so many absent from the House, and I know there are several who would like to speak on the question.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Giddings of Gorham,
Adjourned.