

# 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-Third Legislature**

of the

**State of Maine.**

1907.

**HOUSE.**

Wednesday, March 13, 1907.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Herrick of Hall-owell.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

**Senate Bills on First Reading.**

Resolve providing for publication of index of Private and Special Laws.

An Act to regulate the use of a certain road in the town of Readfield.

An Act to prevent the pollution of the waters of Cobbosseecontee Great pond, Jamies pond, Sanborn pond, Purgatory ponds, Pleasant pond and Cobbosseecontee river.

An Act to incorporate the Winthrop Sprin Co.

An Act to incorporate the Upper St. John River Improvement Co.

An Act to incorporate the Ocean and Northern Railroad Co.

An Act to amend the charter of the Portland and Cape Elizabeth Ferry Co. (Read a third time and passed to be engrossed under suspension of the rules on motion of Mr. Jordan of Portland.)

An Act to incorporate the Caribou and Washburn Street Railway.

An Act relating to Eastport Electric Light Co. and Pembroke Power Co. (Tabled on motion of Mr. Pike of Eastport, pending passage to be engrossed.)

An Act to extend the charter of the Camden and Liberty Railroad.

An Act legalizing certain acts of the town of Stonington.

An Act to confer additional powers and privileges upon the People's Ferry Co. (Read a third time and passed to be engrossed under a suspension of the rules, on motion of Mr. Jordan of Portland.)

An Act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes relating to corporations.

An Act in relation to public landings.

An Act to provide for sewerage in the town of Stockton Springs.

Mr. Dutton of Belfast, offered amendment "A," which was adopted, and the bill was then assigned for tomorrow morning.

An Act to amend Section 30 of

Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 127 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to railroad branch tracks.

An Act to provide for amendments to articles of association filed under Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes, relating to street railroads.

An Act to amend Chapter 13 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, relating to Lake Nequasset.

An Act to amend "An Act to enlarge the powers of the Carrabassett Stock Farms."

An Act to incorporate the Castine and Brooksville Ferry Co. (Tabled pending second reading on motion of Mr. Joy of Eden.)

An Act to incorporate the Suburban Water District of Farmington, Me.

An Act to amend and extend the charter of the Union River Water Storage Co.

An Act to amend the charter of the city of Portland.

An Act to incorporate the North Bridgton Water Co.

An Act authorizing the payment of an annuity by the city of Portland to Ann M. Burnham.

An Act granting Charles H. Scott the right to maintain a ferry across Eggmoggin Reach in Hancock county, came from the Senate amended by Senate Amendment "A."

The House reconsidered the votes whereby this bill was passed to be enacted and passed to be engrossed, Senate Amendment "A" was adopted in concurrence and the bill was then passed to be engrossed as amended.

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

**Judiciary.**

By Mr. Brawn of Bradley--Remonstrance of George H. Livermore and 30 others against the passage of an act to incorporate the Penobscot River Power Co.

**Legal Affairs.**

By Mr. Weld of Old Town--Bill, An Act to authorize municipal corporations to own, maintain and operate plants and works for supplying water, gas and electricity for municipal purposes

and uses.

**Appropriations and Financial Affairs.**

By Mr. Hadlock of Cranberry Isles—Resolve in favor of J. Merrill Lord, chairman of the House committee on elections.

**Labor.**

By Mr. Duncan of Rockland—Bill, An Act additional to and amendatory of Chapter 9 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the better assessing and collecting of poll taxes.

**Taxation.**

By Mr. Colcord of Searsport—Bill, An Act to amend Section 72 of Chapter 19 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the collection of taxes.

By Mr. Hill of Machias—Bill, An Act for the better collection of taxes.

**Placed on File.**

By Mr. Ferry of Randolph—Petition of Bert Dunton and 23 others of Randolph for an amendment to Article 4 of the Constitution of the State of Maine, establishing a people's veto through the optional referendum and a direct initiative through petition and at general or special elections.

By Mr. Cobb of Gardiner—Petition of T. S. Johnson and eight others of Gardiner for same; of Henry W. Dodge and 37 others of Gardiner for same.

**Reports of the Committees.**

Mr. Goodwin from the Committee on the Judiciary reported "ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to repeal Section 40 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes of 1903, relating to fees of registers of probate on estates of persons not a resident of this State."

Mr. Davies from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to provide for annual returns to the Secretary of State of stockholders in corporations."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve proposing an amendment to Section 1, Article 11 of the Constitution of Maine, relating to qualifications of electors.

Mr. Montgomery from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 88, Section 55 of the Revised Statutes relating to trustee process."

Same gentleman from same Com-

mittee reported same on Bill "An Act to incorporate the Corporation Guarantee and Trust Company."

Mr. Smith from same Committee on petition of Sarah G. Paine and 36 others for the enactment of a law to prohibit expectoration on all public floors and sidewalks, reported that the petitioners had leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported "ought not pass" on Bill "An Act to incorporate Maine Title Guarantee Company."

Mr. Waldron from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to prohibit the making or publishing of false or exaggerated statements or publications of, or concerning the affairs, pecuniary condition or property of any corporation, joint stock association or individuals."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to authorize the selectmen of the town of Embden to remove the bodies in an abandoned cemetery."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 89 of the Public Laws of 1905, relative to notice to beneficiaries under wills."

Mr. Hall from the Committee on Legal Affairs on petition of P. O. Brink and 27 others, residents of Oxford county, requesting that the law relative to the bounty upon bears be so amended and changed that the bounty be paid by the respective town treasurers instead of as now paid, reported that the petitioners had leave to withdraw.

Mr. Dunton from same Committee on Bill "An Act to provide for the proper labeling of medicines containing alcohol and narcotic drugs and to prevent the manufacture and sale of adulterated drugs," reported that the subject matter is contained in another bill and that legislation thereon is inexpedient.

Mr. Stearns from same Committee reported "ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to prohibit the use of automobiles and motor vehicles upon public ways in the town of North Haven."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to authorize Elliottsville Plantation to

build and maintain its roads and bridges and to raise money for that purpose."

Mr. Merrill from the Committee on Inland Fish and Game on petition of W. P. Mackintosh and others praying for an act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, relative to a close time on game birds, reported that the same be placed on file.

Same gentleman from same Committee to which was referred Bill "An Act to annul the lease or contract between the Fish and Game Commissioners of the State of Maine and the Lake Auburn Fish Protective Association," reported "legislation thereon inexpedient."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of C. M. Simonds and 41 others for a law to regulate the taking of white perch, reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of E. M. Richards and 21 others praying for a law to prohibit the shipping and sale of fish to markets out of the State of fish caught in the West Branch of the St. Croix River and tributaries, reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition of R. J. Shaw and 41 others praying for the passage of a law to prohibit the sale of trout and land locked salmon in the county of Cumberland.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition of R. A. Young in favor of a change in the laws relating to the killing of song birds.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition of Guy M. Haseltine and others praying that all fishing be prohibited in Pleasant Pond, Denmark, for a period of five years.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on petition of E. A. Cummings and 29 others of Belgrade for a law permitting the throwing of sawdust into Long Pond, Kennebec county.

Same gentleman from same Committee reported "ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to open the tributaries to

Bonneg Beg Pond in Sanford and North Berwick to fishing."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 407 of the Private and Special Laws, to allow summer fishing in Jimmy Pond in Litchfield, Kennebec county."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 407 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the throwing of sawdust into certain streams."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Resolve for the purpose of completing the fish hatchery and feeding station at Raymond, Cumberland county, Maine.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 3 of Chapter 32 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the shooting of gulls."

Mr. Thomas from the committee on shore fisheries on petition of C. S. Dunning and others praying for an amendment to the existing law making the owners of the shore the owners of the clams, reported that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Mr. Herrick from same committee reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act to permit H. D. Crie and his assigns to extend a fish weir from the shore of Castine."

Mr. Hibbard from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act for the better protection of clams in the town of Steuben, in Washington county."

Mr. McKinney from the committee on pensions reported "ought not to pass" on resolve in favor of Rose Kelley.

Mr. Folsom from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of Thomas Banks of Sanford.

Mr. Allan from the committee on labor reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act limiting the number of hours of labor for river and stream drivers on the Kennebec river."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 48 of Chapter 40 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the em-

ployment of women and minors in manufacturing or mechanical establishments."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act amending Sections 52 and 56 of Chapter 40 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the employment of children in manufacturing and mechanical establishments."

Mr. Colcord from the committee on taxation reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act to provide for the taxation of trust companies."

Mr. Perkins from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes relating to annual excise tax on railroads."

Mr. Hill from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes relating to taxation of railroad companies."

The reports were accepted and sent to the Senate.

Mr. Merrill from the committee on inland fish and game reported "ought not to pass" on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 407 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the throwing of mill waste into certain streams."

On motion of Mr. McKinney of Bridgton the report was tabled, pending acceptance.

Mr. Johnson from the committee on the judiciary reported "ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act to extend the charter of the Old Town Water District."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to incorporate the Monson Light and Power Company."

Mr. Davies from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to confirm the incorporation of the Maine Children's Home Society."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to legalize and confirm the acts of the Free Will Baptist Parish of Limerick."

Mr. Goodwin from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 41 of Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes relating to the pow-

ers, limitations and penalties of plantations."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 1, Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes relating to the pollution of water."

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 144 of Chapter 142 of the Revised Statutes, relating to earnings of prisoners committed to houses of correction."

Mr. Dutton from the committee on legal affairs reported "ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act to amend Section 6 of Chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, to provide for the recording of assignments of wages."

Mr. Dyer from same committee reported same on Bill, "An Act to legalize the acts of Pleasant Ridge Plantation in the county of Somerset."

Mr. Hall from same committee reported "ought to pass in new draft under same title" on Bill, "An Act to amend Chapter 352 of the Laws of 1905, relating to the Caribou municipal court."

Mr. Hadlock from same committee reported "ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act to extend the charter of the Island Falls Water Company."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act additional to Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, relating to paupers."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act amending Section 24 of Chapter 144 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the insane hospitals."

Mr. Crosby from the Committee on Mercantile Affairs and Insurance reported "ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to incorporate the Central Maine Insurance Company," under title of "An Act to incorporate the Central Maine Fire Insurance Company."

Mr. Colcord from the Committee on Banks and Banking reported "ought to pass in new draft under same title" on Bill "An Act to incorporate the Danforth Trust Company."

Mr. Waldron from the Committee on State Lands and State Roads reported "ought to pass" on Resolve authoriz-

ing the State Land Agent to sell certain lots in the towns of St. Agatha and Madawaska in Aroostook county.

Mr. Stevens from the same Committee reported same on Resolve authorizing the Land Agent to convey to Lemuel H. Stover of Brunswick, Maine, certain ledges in Casco Bay, known as Irony Island.

Mr. Mayo from the Committee on Interior Waters reported "ought to pass in new draft under same title" on Resolve in favor of building a breakwater in Moosehead Lake, near Kineo.

Mr. Merrill from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on petition of C. G. Dummer and 19 others praying for an appropriation of \$200 for screening Lake Webb, Franklin county, reported resolve entitled Resolve to appropriate \$100 to screen Lake Webb in the county of Franklin.

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of A. E. Cunningham and others praying for the passage of a law prohibiting the throwing of sawdust and other refuse into Olamon Stream, reported Bill entitled "An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and other refuse into Olamon Stream, so called, in the county of Penobscot."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of I. D. Hodgdon and 16 others of Wayne praying for a law prohibiting ice fishing in Pocasset Lake and Pickerel Pond in the county of Kennebec, reported Bill entitled "An Act to regulate fishing in Pocasset Lake and Pickerel Pond in the county of Kennebec."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of John M. Glidden Jr., and 53 others of Lincoln county, relating to the open season on duck in Lincoln county, reported Bill entitled "An Act to extend the open season on duck in Lincoln county."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of Charles L. Rice and others of Litchfield, for the passage of an act closing Jimmy Pond in Litchfield, and the stream flowing from it, also the streams flowing into it, to all fishing, also to close Buker, Sand, Long or Purgatory and Little Purga-

tory Ponds to ice fishing for five years, reported Bill entitled "An Act to regulate fishing in Jimmy, Buker, Sand, Long or Purgatory and Little Purgatory Ponds."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of Nathaniel Hobbs and others for a law to prohibit fishing for trout and white perch in Bonneg Beg Pond, situated in Sanford and North Berwick, for three years, reported Bill entitled "An Act to regulate fishing in Bonneg Beg Pond in Sanford and North Berwick in the county of York."

Same gentleman from same Committee on petition of G. L. Smith and others praying that Meadow Brook, so called, and tributaries, be closed to fishing, reported Bill entitled "An Act to regulate fishing in Meadow Brook, so called, and its tributaries in the county of Oxford"

Same gentleman from same Committee reported "ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to repeal Chapter 248 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, amendatory to Section 3 of Chapter 407 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the time and number of fish that can be taken in the streams lying wholly or partly in the towns of Freeman, Salem and Strong."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act for the protection of deer in York county."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to regulate fishing in Spear Stream and tributaries in the county of Oxford."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to prohibit the sale of trout in Washington county."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to regulate the taking of fish in the tributaries to Mount Blue Pond in the county of Franklin."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to regulate the taking of fish in Loon Lake and in Cow Pond, so called, in the county of Franklin."

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act

to regulate fishing in the Fenderson Brook and all its tributaries in the town of Parsonfield."

Mr. Peacock from the Committee on Shore Fisheries reported "ought to pass" on Bill "An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 317 of the Special Laws of 1901," entitled "An Act to protect lobsters in the waters adjacent to the shores of the towns of Lubec and Trescott."

Mr. Thomas from same committee reported "ought to pass in new draft under same title" on Bill, An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes, relating to seines."

Mr. Lane from the committee on claims reported "ought to pass" on resolve in favor of Harry A. Furbish.

Mr. Merrill from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of the town of Monson.

Mr. Dondero from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of Meddybemps.

Mr. Theriault from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of L. C. Morse.

Mr. Libby from same committee reported same on Resolve in favor of the town of Baring in Washington county.

Mr. Tucker from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of A. L. Dow & Co. of Portland.

Mr. Barrows from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of the town of New Portland.

Same gentleman from same committee reported same on resolve in favor of A. F. Arbo.

Mr. Hall from the committee on insane hospitals on Bill, "An Act authorizing the trustees of the Maine Insane hospital to execute a contract for an additional supply of water for fire and other purposes, at said hospital, reported resolve entitled Resolve in favor of the Maine Insane hospital.

Mr. Perkins from the committee on temperance reported "ought to pass in new draft" on Bill, "An Act prohibiting publications relating to patent or other medicines in language of immoral tendency, or of ambiguous character, and protecting the public against the dangers from the indiscriminate distribution of samples of medicines," under title of "An Act prohibiting publi-

cation relating to patent or other medicines in language of immoral character, and protecting the public against the dangers from the indiscriminate distribution of samples of medicine or medicines."

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

Mr. Merrill from the committee on inland fish and game reported "ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act to prohibit the throwing of sawdust and other mill waste into Bog brook and tributaries in the counties of Oxford and Androscoggin."

The report was tabled, pending acceptance, on motion of Mr. Stearns of Norway.

Majority report of the committee on temperance reporting "ought to pass" on Bill, "An Act to repeal Sections 14 to 35 inclusive of Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the establishment of a State agency for sale of intoxicating liquors."

(Signed) Messrs. A. E. IRVING,  
L. B. WALDRON,  
F. I. BROWN,  
FRED POOLER,  
E. E. NEWBERT.

Minority report of same committee reporting "ought not to pass" on same bill.

(Signed) Messrs. LIBBY,  
PERKINS,  
DOW,  
HASTINGS,

Pending acceptance of either report, both were tabled, and Thursday, March 14, assigned for their further consideration, on motion of Mr. Dow of Brooks.

#### First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves.

An Act additional to and amendatory of Chapter 3 of the Private and Special Laws of the year 1887 entitled "An Act to supply the people of the town of Presque Isle with pure water."

An Act to incorporate the Livermore Falls Sewer District. (Read a third time and passed to be engrossed under a suspension of the rules, on motion of Mr. Merriman of East Livermore.)

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 46 of the Revised Statutes, as amended



by Chapter 90 of the Public Laws of 1905, relating to interest on loans on personal property.

An Act to authorize clergymen to solemnize marriages.

An Act to prohibit the taking of lobsters in Hancock county.

An Act to create a board of harbor commissioners for the city of South Portland.

An Act to incorporate the Waldobro Water Company. (Read a third time and passed to be engrossed under a suspension of the rules, on motion of Mr. Davies of Yarmouth.)

**Passed to Be Engrossed.**

An Act relating to the Rumford Falls and Rangeley Lakes Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Maine Live Stock Insurance Company.

An Act to extend the charter of the Old Town Trust Company.

An Act to amend Section 79 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes of 1903, relating to the time within which academies shall receive State aid under Section 76 of said chapter.

An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes relating to public schools.

An Act to ratify and confirm the organization of the Westbrook Gas Company and to give said company additional power.

An Act to incorporate the Thomas Brackett Reed Memorial Association.

An Act to incorporate Cornish, Light & Power Company.

Mr. Lord of Parsonsfield, offered amendment "A" to the title, by adding after the word "Cornish" the word "Water."

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

An Act to extend the charter of the Cumberland Trust Co.

An Act to extend the charter of the Bluehill Trust and Banking Co.

Resolve in aid of erecting a building at Van Buren College for college purposes.

An Act to incorporate the Mount Abram Telephone and Telegraph Co.

An Act additional to and amendatory

to Chapter 336 of the Private and Special Laws of 1905, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Central Safe Deposit Co.," and to change the name of said company.

An Act to encourage the compiling and teaching of local history and local geography in the public schools.

An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 381 of the Revised Statutes relating to the taking of eels in the Damascotta river.

Resolve in favor of Louis D. Greenwood.

Resolve in favor of Private Hugh Monahan of Company L, 1st Infantry, Portland, Me. (Tabled pending passage to be engrossed for printing statement of facts, on motion of Mr. Milliken of Island Falls.)

Resolve to provide water supply at State Camp Grounds.

Resolve in favor of the town of Frenchville, in the county of Aroostook, to assist in building a road in said town.

Resolve in favor of William J. Maxwell. (Tabled pending passage to be engrossed for printing statement of facts on motion of Mr. Milliken of Island Falls.)

**Passed to Be Enacted.**

An Act to amend Chapter 144 of the Revised Statutes, relating to commitment and support of the insane.

An Act to extend the charter of the Waterville Gas and Electric Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lisbon Falls Gas and Electric Company.

An Act to incorporate the trustees of Bridgewater Classical Academy.

An Act for the better protection of alewives, shad and sturgeon in various rivers in Maine.

An Act to incorporate the Peaks Island Water and Light Company.

An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 158 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the Brunswick and Topsham Water District.

An Act to authorize the Auburn water commissioners to make a further issue of bonds to be used for the purposes of its incorporation.

An Act to incorporate the Baker

Specer Brook Dam and Improvement Co.

An Act to revise the charter of the city of Westbrook.

#### Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Dow of Brooks, the rules were suspended, that gentleman introduced the following order:

Ordered, That a committee of seven on the part of the House, with such as the Senate may join, be appointed to consider and to report the order of proceedings to be observed upon the hearing proposed by the resolve of the two branches upon the alleged causes of removal in the case of Harry J. Chapman, judge of the municipal court of the city of Bangor; and that the clerk of the House be directed to issue due subpoenas for the summoning of witnesses to be present and testify at such hearing upon application of either prosecution of defence; and that counsel be furnished either party.

The order received a passage.

On motion of Mr. McKinney of Bridgton, the vote was reconsidered whereby the House adopted the report of the committee on bill to amend Section 5 of Chapter 497 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, relating to the throwing of mill waste into certain streams, and on further motion by Mr. McKinney the bill and report were tabled.

#### Resubmission.

Special assignment: Majority and minority reports of committee on temperance reporting resolve to abrogate the 5th amendment to the Constitution "ought not to pass" and "ought to pass."

Mr. NEWBERT of Augusta: Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen: In the closing days of the 73rd Legislature we are to consider a question of far reaching importance. Resubmission is a paramount issue in Maine politics, and will continue to be such until settled and settled right. The story is told of an Irishman in Bangor, an intense fellow, and a resubmissionist. During the September campaign he talked the issue by day and dreamed of it at night. A Republican neighbor met him one morning and said: "Pat, you are intense. Always absorbed in some issue, you are now a resubmis-

sionist. I wonder what you would have been if you hadn't been a resubmissionist." "And is it what I would of ben," Pat replied. "Well, sir, I'm tellin' of ye, sir, wan thing I can tell ye, I would of ben ashamed."

I have no desire to discuss this great question in any narrow spirit. I do not advocate it for partisan ends. That parties gain or lose because of the issue interests me not. There are a few questions which rise above mere partisan purposes and cheap political aims. Resubmission is such a question, and we should approach its consideration actuated only by disinterested and patriotic motives. I have little sympathy with any man who would argue this moral problem, a problem which so vitally concerns us as a people and has such moral and economic significance, from the low plane of mere party expediency. This Legislature has before it matters of grave moment, but none more grave than this. Indeed so great is this issue that other matters might well wait on its solution. We are met here by a question which touches our moral life, our economic well-being, our reputation, our public and private honor, our social virtues.

There must be good reasons for resubmitting this question to the people, else we have no right to tamper with the constitution of the State. The reasons which I shall give are the results of years of study and observation. I shall go too far for many on this floor, and if I am in error, you will charge it against me only as an error of judgment. After half a century of Prohibition, it is time that this question was frankly discussed. It has been said that resubmission means a condemnation of the prohibitory law, and I agree that this is so. It can not be otherwise. Did I believe that prohibition is right in theory and worked well in practice, I should want no other system. Did I think that prohibition is the best solution of the liquor traffic and did I know that it makes for temperance and sobriety, I should be unwilling to take it out of our constitution. It is a deep seated conviction with me that prohibition as a State policy is radically wrong in theory, a failure in practical application. Our

liquor legislation is all wrong, and for more than fifty years we have blundered and bungled in this matter. We have been neither wise, consistent nor honest, and have deluded ourselves but we have not deceived the world.

Resubmission can not be discussed without a discussion of the prohibitory law. I believe the demand for resubmission is justified in the light of the history of State prohibition, and I might preface this reference to the history of the question by quoting the words of Bishop Potter. Speaking of prohibition in all its phases Bishop Potter has referred to it as "tainted with falsehood, dishonored by essential unreality and discredited by wide spread and consistent failure."

In all 17 states have (at some time, experimented with prohibition. Of the 17 Kansas, North Dakota and Maine are left. The State of Maine led in the prohibitory movement, the first prohibitory law having been adopted in 1851. Between 1851 and 1854 a wave of prohibitory sentiment swept New England reaching out to other states. Within those years all of the New England States adopted prohibitory laws. Today Maine stands alone among her sister New England States in this matter. Prohibition was adopted in Connecticut in 1854, and license and local option substituted in 1872. In 1889 a prohibition amendment to the constitution was defeated by popular vote. Rhode Island adopted prohibition in 1852. In 1875 a license and local option law was passed. In 1886 a prohibitory amendment to the constitution was adopted by popular vote. Three years later this amendment was resubmitted to the people and was annulled. Massachusetts adopted in 1852 a prohibitory law similar to the Maine law. The law, however, was repealed in 1874. In 1889 a prohibitory amendment to the constitution was defeated by popular vote. Prohibition in New Hampshire dates from 1855. An attempt to write the law into the constitution was defeated by the people in 1889. New Hampshire has had license and local option since 1903. In Vermont the prohibitory law went into effect in 1852. After fifty years of disastrous experiment Vermont repealed

the prohibition law and substituted license and local option in 1902. In all the states that have had prohibitory laws and repealed them the policy is admitted to have been a failure. Massachusetts widely known for its laws, its great men, its marvelous prosperity and its magnificent institutions, the vigor of its manhood and the peace of its homes, knew enough to stop the great farce in 1874. For a third of a century Massachusetts has prospered and improved under license and local option. At the end of this half century of statutory and constitutional prohibition the people of Maine who have carefully observed and who think deeply come to sit in judgment upon this prohibitory policy. The history is one to make us blush with shame. Nullification far from being the exception during all these years has been the rule. The law has played into the hands of the more vicious class. It has corrupted men in politics. It has confused the judiciary. It has blunted our conscience. No man has played with it for political purposes who has come forth with clean hands. It has made possible an alliance between the liquor interests and the machine politician. It never made for sobriety and in all these years it has placed a premium upon political dishonor and made perjury safe, popular and profitable. Viewed in the light of its history, I submit that the prohibitory policy of the State of Maine is unworthy the support of the people of our State and should be done away with.

And I believe further that the demand for resubmission is justified by the fact, well known and generally admitted, that the prohibitory law is not a temperance measure. In the very nature of things it never can be such. Men are not made righteous by law, and the very principle of prohibition runs counter to human nature. Sumptuary laws not only have never been popular with a free people, but no state is successful in their enforcement.

Dr. Archibald Reed of the London Lancet, foremost among the medical journals of the world, has recently stated in an address in London: "As to prohibition, London, New York and Chicago, which

are without it, have respectively 7, 23 and 13 drunkards per 1000, while Portland in Maine, the classic prohibition State, has 42." I have lived in Massachusetts cities, I have lived three years in the central West, and I am prepared to say that I believe there is more drunkenness in the cities of Maine in proportion to their population than in other cities great and small in this country. I have gone to some pains to get certain statistics which I desire to go into the record. Take a few of the cities of Maine for illustration and comparison. Let me take the figures for 1906 when, if at any time in our prohibitory history, there has been something like enforcement in the State. The arrests for drunkenness in the following Maine cities for the year 1906 is valuable for study: Waterville 344, or 3 per cent. of the population; Biddeford 480, or 3 per cent. of the population; Rockland 349, or 4 per cent. of the population; Lewiston 719, or 2 per cent. of the population; Calais 311, or 4 per cent. of the population; Portland 2173, or 4 per cent. of the population; Old Town 255, or 4 per cent. of the population; Rumford Falls 180, or 5 per cent. of the population; Bangor 2396, or 11 per cent. of the population. Compare a few cities in license and local option states. The arrests for drunkenness in the city of Portland for the past 10 years average 35 per one thousand people, or 3½ per cent. In the cities of Milwaukee, Louisville and Cincinnati the arrests for drunkenness for the same period average 10 per one thousand inhabitants, or 1 per cent. It is said that but one city in the country exceeds the record of Portland and not one equals that of Bangor. Take a few Massachusetts cities whose inhabitants have much the same temperament as the people of Maine. There is no city in Massachusetts that even approximates the record of arrests for drunkenness in Bangor. Little Rumford Falls is worse than Boston. In 1905 its arrests for drunkenness amounted to 8 per cent. of its population, while the records of Boston with its great foreign population was only 5 per cent. The manufacturing city of Brockton with a population of nearly 50,000 has a record of arrests for drunkenness of only 3 per cent. The city of Cambridge with a population of nearly 100,000 has a record of only 1 per cent.

The great industrial city of Fall River with a population much exceeding 160,000 shows only 2 per cent. The city of Fitchburg with a population of nearly 40,000 is the same. Lawrence with a population of over 70,000 the same. The only city in Massachusetts which equals Boston in its arrests for drunkenness is that of Lynn, given over to manufacturing purposes, a city of more than 80,000. Malden, a city of 40,000, has a record of only three-fourths of 1 per cent. Medford, which gives its name to an honest brand of New England rum, practically as large as Bangor, has a record of only ½ of 1 per cent. New Bedford, the great cotton centre, with a population of nearly 80,000, shows but 2 per cent. The city of Newton shows but 1 per cent. The city of Somerville, with a population of nearly 75,000, but 1 per cent. Springfield, a city of nearly 80,000, only 2 per cent. Waltham, a manufacturing city larger than Lewiston, only 1 per cent. The city of Worcester, second in size to Boston, has a record for the year of only 2 per cent. These stubborn facts should teach us something. Just keep the per cent. in mind. Milwaukee, far-famed for her breweries, a city of 300,000, whose people look upon malt liquors as we do upon milk and water, with arrests for drunkenness in 1906 of only 2700, or less than 1 per cent. of the inhabitants. On the other hand Bangor, with a population of only about 22,000. Consider the arrests for drunkenness in Bangor for the past 12 months, aggregating 2396, or only 300 less than the great city of Milwaukee. Less than 1 per cent. of arrests for drunkenness where malt liquors flow like water, and Bangor 11 per cent. of the population. Ten persons to every one thousand in Milwaukee arrested for drunkenness, 119 persons in every one thousand in Bangor. Last summer the Bangor Sunday Republican reported that for seven days in the latter part of August there were 134 arrests in Bangor, 133 of which were for drunkenness. And here are more figures that argue for themselves: Increase of arrests for drunkenness in Massachusetts for 1905-1906: Boston, decrease of 1 per cent.; Cambridge, decrease of 1¼ per cent.; Somerville, decrease of 1½ per cent.; Worcester, increase of 6 per cent.; Taunton, decrease of 3½ per cent. Compare this with the cities of Maine.

We should remember that this increase as given for Maine covers the period when the enforcement commission was doing business and when Maine cities were supposed to be dry.

Increase of arrests for drunkenness in Maine, 1905-1906: Biddeford, increase 32 per cent.; Portland, increase 36 per cent.; Bangor, increase 31 per cent.; Bath, increase 37 per cent.; Calais, increase 60 per cent.; Saco, increase 37 per cent.; Brewer, increase 75 per cent. Or another comparison: Commitments for all causes in Massachusetts for ten years ending 1905 increased less than 4 per cent. Commitments for drunkenness during the same period increased 12 per cent. Commitments for all causes in Maine for ten years ending 1901 increased 45 per cent. Commitments in Maine for drunkenness for same period increased 94 per cent.

Arguments are often made in defence of prohibition on the ground that it is a measure of great economic value and that it promotes industry and thrift. Our savings banks are pointed to. As a citizen of Maine I am proud of the fact that our people have wrung from adverse conditions savings on deposit in our savings banks \$80,000,000. This splendid sum, however, is no argument in favor of prohibition. It is true that we have in our savings banks what amounts to \$114 per capita. But let us not forget that New York has \$130 or that Massachusetts has \$221. Maine has a deposit for every four persons in the State, but Massachusetts has one for every two persons. In 1905 New Hampshire increased her savings bank deposits by nearly \$6,000,000; Maine, a little less than half the population of Maine, about \$2,500,000.

Our criminal statistics, too, are all against us; our insane statistics nothing to boast. The reports of the attorney general for 50 years are valuable for study. That crime has increased in Maine during the last half century all out of proportion to the slow growth in population is a question beyond dispute. Compare the decade ending 1898 with that ending with 1868, and you will find that sentences for crime in the higher courts have increased 400 per cent. Or study the period of six years following 1898 and you will find that the ratio of gain means

a still greater increase for the ten years ending 1908. An authority has recently said that if Maine would repeal her prohibitory law her criminal statistics would be cut down one-half.

In New York under the operation of the liquor tax law of 1896 the commissioner of excise reports in 1904 a decrease of 18 per cent. in crimes against person and property in eight years. He also reports a decrease for the same time in the prison population of 8 per cent., or, based on the growth of population, a decrease of 23½ per cent. Our insane statistics for what they are worth. On the basis of those under treatment in 1840 and 1905, the difference is expressed by an increase of 900 per cent.

The opponents of resubmission have argued that resubmission means the saloon in Maine.

I am not speaking in the interests of saloons or in behalf of the liquor interest. I assume that the gentlemen to whom I speak are sensible and practical men in touch with life. I maintain that Maine has had the saloon and had it in its worst form, whether open or concealed, for it has been undirected, unlimited and unrestrained. Who in this House does not know that for 50 years the liquor traffic in Maine has found a most fertile field? Who does not know that the saloon has flourished here? Who does not know that the liquor traffic has been practically unrestrained? Who does not know that the saloon has been a debauching influence in our politics, a debaser of the morals of our people and a stench in our nostrils for all these years?

I will not take you into ancient history, but I will call your attention to a state of things which existed in Maine according to the very best authority, in 1893. I quote this record of an earlier date because I know it is reliable. In 1903 Portland had 182 liquor shops, or one to every 219 inhabitants; Lewiston had 200; Augusta had 62, one to every 170 inhabitants; Gardiner a drinking place for every 274 people; Waterville had one to every 200 inhabitants; Rockland one to every 171 inhabitants; Bangor had 185, or one to every 100 inhabitants. Under the Massachusetts laws saloons outside of Boston are limited

to one to every 1000 inhabitant. In comparison with this limit compare these records of the cities of Maine in 1893. I call to your attention certain other facts which tend to show that the saloon in Maine is not a novelty. In 1905, about July 1, when the Sturgis commission was in full swing and when liquor dealers were afraid, and hundreds were giving up their United States licenses, there were in Maine 1051 United States liquor dealers' licenses, or one to every 700 inhabitants. At the same time the state of Vermont, under local option, had but 354, or one to every 980 inhabitants. North Dakota, a prohibition state, had United States taxes for every 340 persons. South Dakota is a local option state and it had one United States tax only to every 884 persons. Kansas is prohibition, yet Kansas had United States tax for every 517. Arkansas is local option, yet Arkansas had only one such tax to every 1226 of the population. With all its large negro population the South is far ahead of us in its handling of the liquor traffic. For the 12 months covering the above, Mississippi, a local option state, had only 611 United States liquor licenses, or one to every 3240 people. Kentucky, associated in our minds with blue grass and whiskey, makes a far better showing than either North Dakota or Kansas.

Again I believe the demand for Re-submission is justified on the ground of the inability of the State to enforce the prohibitory law. The law has never been enforced in Maine. It is not enforced today. We have had spasms and periods of hysteria when, over irritated the people have demanded that officials should no longer wink at nullification, but we have had no enforcement. The constabulary law of 1867 died in infancy. The Sturgis law of 1905 has few supporters and no friends. Yet if the people of Maine believe in prohibition, why should they object to enforcement? Or if they believe in enforcement, why object to the Sturgis commission? In times of spasmodic enforcement scandal and failure accompany the effort. Whether in city or country, people rebel against an invasion of their individual rights and liberties. They refuse to

have guardianship thrust upon them. Nothing has so corrupted society in Maine as nullification. On the other hand the people are irritated beyond telling with prohibition enforced. The self-righteous citizen takes it as a personal rebuff if his druggist refuses to sell him a pint of alcohol or gin. Uuillified, the prohibitory law is a menace to the good order of society. Nullification imperils our reputation as a state; it invites perjury; it corrupts county and state officials. Yet enforced prohibition is tyranny. The story is told of an Irish hod-carrier who came into Portland last summer. The poor man fell with his hod from a six-story brick building, and struck on his head on the pavement. When he came to himself he was in the hospital and he began to move his lips as if tasting. He did it several times and then his eyes opened and he feebly said: "An' whats in me mouth?" The doctor replied: "We have wet your lips with water." Again he tasted and a look of disgust grew on his bandaged face. "An' water is it?" he murmured. "In the name of hiven how many stories must a poor man fall in Maine till he have his bleeding lips wet with wan drap of whiskey?"

That the law has not been enforced under the Sturgis Commission is admitted by everybody. If the intention was honest, then somebody has failed in his duty. Why did no deputies go into Penobscot? Or who denies that Biddeford and Bangor were open? With 2400 arrests for drunkenness in the past year, who dares to say that Bangor is not the Bangor of old? Can it be said that prohibition is a success in Bangor or Portland? The Finnish gentleman who observed conditions of our liquor traffic last summer said that he saw more drunkenness in Portland than in his travels from Baltimore to Maine, and his tour of inspection included Boston. He remarked while in Maine, he liked Bangor better than Portland. "In Portland the saloons are hidden," he says" and there is wrong doing there. In Bangor they are all open. I have seen much liquor sold here." The impossibility of enforcement of prohibition is so well in evi-

dence that little need be said on this point. Records in the Sheriff's office in Cumberland county show that within a few years liquor was seized in Portland on 72 streets and in 500 places. Some man may tell me that Portland is dry today. And yet the liquor traffic has only been driven out of the hotels and away from the main streets. A man may tell me that his boy is now safe in Portland. I am not so sure. At any rate I would ask him if there are no other boys in that city? If his boy is safe, let him think of the sons of the poor who are being lost. Portland does not sell less liquor because the law is enforced. Certainly she does not drink less because of enforcement. The traffic is simply run to cover. You simply take it out of the best hotels and put it into the lowest dives. You hand the traffic over to the prostitute class or drive it into the homes of the poor. A school teacher in Portland is reported to have said that 1000 school children in that city were identified with the liquor traffic. What an arraignment of the prohibitory law. Is it better to have the homes of the poor turned into bar-rooms, with little children runners on the streets at night, or does sober thought devise some better way?

Is there any hope that conditions which have become intolerable will improve? Admitted to be a farce and a failure, shall prohibition continue to be the policy of the State? If we ever are to adopt a rational and cosmopolitan attitude towards the liquor question, action on this great issue of resubmission can not be taken too soon. It is the one necessary step for which all others wait. Will this Legislature take it?

It is my firm belief that a radical revision of our liquor laws is imperatively necessary in the interest of law and order. Let the citizens of Maine demand resubmission until the popular will is obeyed and the old corrupt alliance of prohibition and machine politics is forever done away. Once let all our people know all the truth of failure, discredit and dishonor, and the past in Maine politics will be past, and the future will be full of the promise of better measures and better men. (Applause.)

Mr. DOW of Brooks: Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Augusta but I cannot agree with what he says in the last part of the address. I am one of those who are opposed to resubmission and I am not ashamed of it. I am not prepared to reply to him in a way that I should like, but as a temperance man and one who believes in the prohibitory law of the State of Maine, who has faith in the honesty of the people of the State of Maine and their opinions on this subject, I wish to stand here and protest against resubmission of this amendment to the people at this time.

We believe that the question of resubmission is one very vitally important to the great and varied interests of our State. It introduces an element of uncertainty into the consideration of a question that was supposed to have been settled for all time. The distinct understanding of the people when prohibition was made a part of the constitutional law of the State, was, that the matter had been taken out of politics forever. If I remember rightly the law was adopted by over fifty thousand majority. It was practically the unanimous sentiment of the State that the correct thing had been done. Everybody seemed satisfied. The courts acquiesced in the opinion that the law was constitutionally correct and just, and undisputed confidence seemed established. But now after the lapse of a score of years we find it asserted that some of the people are discontented with the fact that they did not have a chance to vote on the subject. Some of them were not born early enough to get into the Prohibition band wagon, and they demand the right, it is said, to have the whole thing done over again, so that they may give the matter their personal endorsement. In addition to the personal gratification it would give them, they desire to strengthen this law by giving it the honor of their well-considered approval. Why do they select this one phase of our constitutional law and omit all the rest. We became a state over eighty years ago and not a man is living who voted on the Constitution when it was

originally presented to the people. Why not have the whole Constitution re-submitted to the people that they may vote on it to make sure it is all right. Our resubmission friends, who wish to undo the work of years of honest endeavor, for the simple reason, as they say, that they wish to have a chance to vote on it, do not, it seems to me, to appreciate the difference between a simple proposition for their consideration and a well established constitutional law. It is a well established principle which has come down to us from the nations of antiquity that constitutional law should not be disturbed for light and trivial reasons. It should be most carefully considered before enactment, and when once it has become a part of the fundamental law of the State or nation it should be difficult but not impossible to repeal it. The fact, as it seems to me, that this supposed demand of the people that they should have an opportunity to endorse the prohibitory law by their votes is an entirely fictitious proposition. We must throw discredit on the law by voting to resubmit. It is almost entirely the result of supposed political exigency. Our Democratic friends wanted an issue to make votes with, and they very sagaciously selected this as one that would win them at least temporary strength. And it is a credit to their ability that they handled it skilfully during the campaign and won votes on it. If you want to attract attention all you have got to do is to get out and holler. It makes no difference whether you have a subject of merit or not, if you only holler loud enough and long enough somebody will come your way. And our friends in their zeal for resubmission hollered for all they were worth. In fact they hollered so hard that some of the people began to sit up and take notice and to feel that they had been terribly imposed upon by not having a chance to endorse the constitution by their personal vote. It was practically the same thing that happened in New York when the laboring men who were earning more wages than they ever earned before, who were having more home comforts than they ever had before, were deluded by the cry

of the politicians who said you have no right to be contented while any other men are better fed and have better homes than yourselves. They listened to the noise but did not consider the reason. And here in Maine as the election returns came in after the battle had ceased and the smoke cleared away, we find some of the Republican politicians aghast at some of the political changes, and they were all ascribed to the resubmission. And they began to holler for all they were worth that the people demanded resubmission and we must have it. In fact a general panic seemed imminent. But while we question the honesty of the men who are so intensely earnest to add their own personal vote to the endorsement of the law, and have little respect for the men who would advocate resubmission that they might have the pleasure of voting on it, there is a class of men who advocate resubmission for whom we have a high regard. It is those men who would favor resubmission on the ground that the people demand it, and that the people should be heard. That is good sound doctrine. We are a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and the people must be heard. But are those gentlemen right in the supposition that the people demand resubmission? It is a well established principle in this county that the wishes of a majority of the people shall be the law, and unless it is a matter of great wrong or injustice this principle should be cheerfully acquiesced in. It is not supposed that every one shall be satisfied, or everybody believe the same way. In 1854 the prohibitory party was defeated in Maine. Did they say "It is no use, there is opposition and we will go back to license." By no means, they said we are morally right and we will stand by our principles, and in 1856 prohibition won and has since that time in some form been in force in our State. Within the memory of gentlemen present the greenback craze swept over the country. At the last moment the result of the elections were much in doubt, and a civil war was imminent in the State. This capital was



guarded by armed men and bloodshed was narrowly averted. Did the Republican party say the people demand the present inflated system of currency and we will give it up? No indeed, they stood for a sound currency and they conquered on the issue. How plausible the theory of the purity of silver with gold as a basis for our currency seemed to many as the issue was suddenly sprung upon us, but the Republican party made gold their standard and they won out in spite of the large minority which opposed them. Now, we claim that because in some cases the election may have gone against the party who has opposed resubmission it was no reason why they should go back on this issue.

I submit there is no call by the people of the State for resubmission. There is no demand sufficient for people to leave their old-time doctrine and vote for license. Who is backing this call for resubmission? The Rev. Smith Baker said before our committee, "You find 99 per cent. of the ministers of the State of Maine against resubmission. You find 90 per cent. of the church membership of Maine against resubmission." I have in my desk here a petition which came too late to introduce, from the District Lodge of Good Templars of Portland, representing 800 people, opposed to resubmission. I have a petition from the Friends of Kennebec county representing 425 names pledged against resubmission. We have large petitions from Biddeford, Bath, Belfast, Rockland and a petition from Bangor. There are those among the most intelligent and the best citizens of the city of Bangor who do not believe in the liquor business. Almost 20,000 names have come to us in opposition to resubmission. Those petitions have come voluntarily. We have not had a single petition in favor of it. I do not believe that the people of the State of Maine believe in resubmission—not because they are afraid of the people, not because they believe that a majority of the people of the State will vote against them, but because they see that this matter of resubmission is just a trap to draw in some of

the moral, temperance people of this State, and that resubmission is backed by the rum element of the country. The gentleman from Augusta has plainly taken the position that resubmission means license for the State of Maine. Do you wonder that the intelligent temperance people of the State of Maine, understanding that matter as they do, object to come out from the intrenchments of statutory prohibition to fight this matter? No, they are going to stand where they are, in the first intrenchment where they are backed by constitutional law. I submit that prohibition has been a success in the State of Maine to a greater or less extent for the last fifty years. I submit that this rum trust is one of the most dangerous trusts that exist in our country today. The gentleman speaks of states that have gone back to license. He says that in Vermont there are but 25 cities now that vote for license whereas in 1903, 92 voted for it. That goes to show that the people are being educated toward prohibition—not that license is a success but that it is a failure and those people are going back to prohibition. It is so in New Hampshire, it is so in the states of the West. We have a duty not only to ourselves. For fifty years we have had prohibition and other states are looking to us for the influence that we may give to them; and we say that a vote for resubmission by a Democrat or a Republican here today means that you put yourselves in the position of saying that prohibition in Maine has been a failure, and thus do an injury to the people of other states who are looking to us for our influence and support.

I wish to put myself on record as opposing resubmission in Maine. They say that the Republican party today is between the Devil and the deep sea. When they vote on this matter I submit that the Republican party had better stand straight on this question and place their backs to the sea and their faces to the Devil and fight the Devil of license to the ragged, gilt-edged pit of Hell, or else turn up their faces to the deep sea and plunge beneath the ocean of oblivion to be heard of no more forever. (Applause.)

Mr. DAVIES of Yarmouth: Mr. Speaker, The importance of the pending measure cannot be overestimated, for, in my opinion, the day that the Republican party renounces its allegiance to the principle of prohibition, that day's close will witness a waning of power in the dominant party in the State of Maine. This measure urges us to take the first step. I solemnly protest against its enactment. Who does not believe in self-preservation? Who cares to surrender to our political opponents the enviable position so long held by us, and held with so much credit to ourselves, and with so much advantage and profit to the State's inhabitants?

Men honestly differ in their opinions. The avenues through which their respective social environments lead them, look on to conduct aims and ideals which are marked with inherent personal qualities peculiar to themselves. I have no harsh and furious epithets to apply to my political opponents, who do not endorse my sentiments, or who do not approve of my methods. I can believe that they love truth as passionately, they desire to fulfill duty as amply as we do. I impute to them no mercenary motives of action, no disloyalty to a cause. They are not necessarily rummies, or men who know no honor but expedience, no law but prudence. Some of them are my intimate acquaintances, some my firm friends, and only when love has gone out from the heart's altar, and when memory has emptied its urn into forgetfulness, can I fail to realize the many qualities which bind me to many of them.

Political parties exist to bear the responsibilities of government. The responsibilities of government include all things necessary and just to increase the prosperity of the people, and develop them in knowledge and wisdom, co-operating with such measures and restrictions as will promote a higher standard of citizenship. Even keeping this purpose of government in view, my mind does not resist the impression that the liquor question is one which is more moral than political, but it has become inextricably woven

into our political life, and we must deal with it as we find it; and conditions, circumstances and experiments in states other than ours will be valuable only when their topography, population, industry and standards of living are similar, unless it is in a general way.

Legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor has long been identified with this commonwealth. It has become the warp and woof of many of our institutions, enriching them in memories of purity and strength. In considering projects and enterprises, unconsciously our people have failed to realize its influence upon other branches of industry and weigh its importance as a factor in failure and success.

All laws are enacted for the purpose of protection. It is the state's duty to keep the peace, maintain order, and guarantee rights, and do all things within its sphere which are requisite and necessary for the welfare of the people. Does the liquor store impede or advance the development of good citizenship? It is always located in the largest numbers where the poorer classes live and takes a well recognized place in community life and has a marked effect upon social problems, character and the tone of our political and domestic life. Who says it discharges an uplifting function? Is it uplifting to inflame the passions? If so, by whose standard of rectitude? Is a cause of poverty to be encouraged? Is it uplifting to convert the potentialities of honest labor into crime. Is it uplifting to create a distaste for steady industry? Who denies that these are not the functions of the saloon? So, then, the purpose of the prohibitory law was primarily to keep the liquor store out of Maine and restrict the use of alcoholic liquors. My mind does not resist the impression that the more attractive you make vice the more powerful it will be. I feel it to be my duty to myself and to the people whom I represent to give my reasons why I shall vote against resubmission. A political party exists for the purpose of disseminating certain principles. It does not exist en-

tirely for the purpose of catching votes. That is a Democratic doctrine. Prohibition was written into our constitution a great many years ago. It is one of the cardinal principles of the Republican party of the State of Maine, and it cannot be made waste paper either by education or by construction. That is one reason why as a Republican I shall not vote for resubmission. Another reason is that the people have passed on that question, and they did so at the last election, and the Republican vote was nearly as large as it is every year, and resubmission was the issue from Fort Kent to Kittery. Another reason is that a vote for resubmission is a condemnation of the prohibitory law. From my point of view I can see absolutely no reason for it, and we as a party should not be driven into it by agitation and for the purpose of making campaign capital against it. My advice is to stand true to the principles that we have always advocated and that we as Republicans have always believed in, and not be diverted to a chase after false gods by our good political friends on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded against the substitution of the minority for the majority report. (Applause.)

Mr. McKINNEY of Bridgton: Mr. Speaker, the issue today is whether we shall resubmit the prohibitory amendment to the people or not. We are not here to vote upon the prohibitory law, we are not here to vote for free rum, nor for high license nor for local option; and I regret exceedingly that we could not have followed out the suggestion of our honored Governor in his inaugural and make it possible to discuss this question plainly and fairly by itself disconnected from the question of prohibition or license. I do not favor this question because I am a Democrat. I favor resubmission as a matter of principle. The reason why I am in favor of resubmission is simply from the fact that there is such a large class of the voters of the State of Maine that are in favor of it. It was stated during the campaign by a Republican paper that where 20 per cent. of the voters of the people of the State were in favor of resubmitting any ar-

ticle in the constitution, it was their right to have that privilege. The Democratic party in their convention adopted a plank in favor of resubmission. The Republicans practically dodged the question. Forty-five per cent. of the voters of this State voted the Democratic ticket. Many Democrats in the State are not in favor of resubmission, but for every Democrat who is opposed to it there is more than one Republican who is in favor of it; and I believe today that one-half of the voters of the State of Maine are in favor of the resubmission of this question. I have been called a rummy since my election to this House because I was in favor of resubmission, but I defy any man of my age to stand here and proclaim himself a better temperance man than I have been; and I shall continue to work for temperance while I have breath and the little voice that God has given me. (Applause.)

Both the Democratic and Republican parties put a plank into their platforms referring questions to the voters of the State. The Democrats made their plank straight in favor of the referendum. The Republican platform contained a plank in favor of the referendum as regards the statute law but no referendum for the constitution. There is only one way in which you can change the constitution and that is by referring it to the people. If this Legislature should grant resubmission, this question must go before the people before the constitution can be changed. And I ask you why you are not willing to give the people the right to vote upon a constitutional question as you are upon the statutes of this State? Now, when it comes to a question of prohibition, let us vote upon prohibition. When it comes to a question of license let us vote upon license. The gentleman from Brooks is not willing that the people should have a voice in this matter of the constitution. Why not? If you are not afraid of the people, if a majority of the voters of the State of Maine are in favor of the amendment, in Heaven's name why don't you let them say so once more and eliminate this question from politics for the next twenty

years? I believe you are afraid to submit it to the people and that is the reason why you are opposed to it. I know I should never vote for a rum shop, but I am in favor of resubmission because I believe there is a demand sufficient so that the people ought to have that right. The gentleman from Brooks says that there are no petitions here in favor of resubmission. Why? Because we have taken no action towards getting petitions. I could go to my town today and I could bring you a petition of 100 as good Republicans as there are in the State of Maine in favor of resubmission. Let us be honest on this question. I am opposed to rum in all its forms, but I believe in the people ruling, and if they are in favor of resubmission let us give them a chance to vote upon it and settle this question for the next generation. I am getting to be an old man, I have seen a good deal of this world, and as true as the sun is in the heavens today, if we don't get resubmission this year the day will come when you will have a Legislature that will carry out the voice of the majority of the people of this State and will resubmit this question to the people. Remember my prophecy. (Applause.)

Mr. THOMAS of Howland—Mr. Speaker and fellow representatives, I would not feel that I was doing justice to my constituents, to my party or to myself to sit here and listen to the arguments upon this great question without a voice in the matter. First, my constituents who, knowing my sentiments and having placed the utmost confidence in me as a temperance man, would turn in scorn from me if they should know I did not stand by the principle they know I so firmly believe in. Second, my own convictions in this matter would be enough to arouse my feeling on this great question. Gentlemen, to me this is one of the most important questions that could possibly come before this Legislature—one that touches the hearts of tens of thousands of fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, who are today looking with earnest hearts and eager eyes to the doings of this Legislature, and I hope and pray that we shall be guided honestly and unselfishly in this

matter looking forward to the betterment of the moral conditions of humanity and never losing sight of the fact that this noble temperance principle was established in the platform of the Republican party when first that party had its birth; and I tell you, gentlemen, if there is one thing that would cause me to depart from the Republican party it would be the drawing of one single nail from that temperance plank that was so firmly nailed into the platform so many years ago.

It is said by the friends of resubmission and it seems to be one of their strong points, that if we had high license saloons we would hold the money in the State that is now going out of the State. We will allow this to be true; but what are we offering in exchange for this money? Are we not offering up the precious souls of our noble young men, and are we not taking the daily bread from the mouths of thousand of poor children and breaking the hearts of many a poor mother? Men depriving their children of the common school education all for the sake of that vile poison. I tell you, gentlemen, it is time we throw off this delusion and wake up to the realization of our condition. Do you not know that the best interests of society are at stake? Must we sacrifice all that is good and noble to satisfy the rumseller? God forbid that we in this enlightened country should come to this.

They say we under the prohibitory law can't stop the sale of liquor. My answer to this, gentlemen, is that if you can't stop a man from stealing horses is it necessary to make horse stealing legal? I agree with you, gentlemen, that the sale of intoxicating liquor has not been successfully prohibited under our prohibitory law, and why is it? Is it the fault of the law? Have the officers at all times and under all circumstances enforced the law? Have the people in the communities where liquor has been sold tried to help the officers enforce the law? Gentlemen, you know they have not, and I tell you, gentlemen, if there was one man in a town where liquor is sold that would help the officers enforce the law where there are 10 to help the man who violates law, the conditions would be far

different than they are today. Gentlemen, we have got all the law that is needed to stop the sale of intoxicating liquors in this State. All we want is honest officers and honest people.

Our opponents tell us if we don't re-submit this question to the people that we will go down in defeat in two years from now. Gentlemen, I stand for principle, and if we must go down by not granting the rumsellers the privilege of selling that most of all ruinous poison, let us go down in defence of the right with our flag at the topmast; for I had rather die fighting for the right than to live and foster a wrong. (Applause.)

Mr. STOVER of Brunswick: Mr. Speaker, as this is the last time probably that I shall ever address this or any other legislative body I ask the indulgence of the House to express a few crude thoughts on the burning question of resubmission, and to say a few kindly words to my Republican friends on standpatism both State and national. I do so with hesitation knowing that I am incapable of treating the subject in a manner its importance demands. But having been sent here by the aid of many Republican votes without instructions from anybody I take it for granted that the sole reason for sending me here was my known views on this question. therefore I do not feel that I can conscientiously shirk the obligation of adding my might to the discussion. There is certainly danger to our free institutions when it becomes a fact that a few fanatics however conscientious they may be, are allowed to either hinder or promote legislation and force their fanatical ideas upon the sovereign people of the State. Their assumption of superiority is an affront to the people of Maine.

If I thought that the prohibitory law promoted temperance, as much as I disapprove of the law itself, I should hesitate before casting my vote, but believing as I do that in cities, villages and thickly populated places it actually promotes drunkenness, and I shall certainly vote for resubmission. Even in the rural districts it is becoming popular to have brush camps in the woods furnished with bottles of beer and a pack of cards where young

men meet to show their contempt for the law.

I do not feel that there is any great harm in a pack of cards or even a glass of beer, but it shows the tendency of this law, and if the friends of the law are satisfied with its workings it shows that they are wedded to a theory and not a condition.

It seems to me that it is time this matter be taken out of politics and these meddling agitators should be sent to the rear. It is my opinion that the law would have been more satisfactory had it not been for the politicians.

Is there anybody so fresh as to believe that such a law would prohibit or even diminish the use of liquor? Does anybody think it promotes temperance? A law that establishes city and town agencies to sell liquor for medicinal and mechanical purposes, and express companies bountifully suppressing all other needs.

When liquor can be bought at wholesale in other states and landed at your door and no one can touch it unless it can be proved that it was intended for sale. Now I want to ask if men are forced into buying their whiskey by the wholesale if it is not quite likely they will eventually drink it by the wholesale? This "so-called" prohibitory law in any way you look at it, is not a jewel or consistency. The legislators did not pass this law to bind themselves but their more humble constituents, they discussed this measure over a bottle of whiskey, and in my hearing said it would not hinder them from getting all they wanted, thus admitting it was class legislation intended to put what they called the lower classes under guardianship.

This was done in what was supposed to be a free country, a country whose Declaration of Independence declared that all men were born free and equal. I have a decided opinion in this matter and am going to express that opinion fearlessly and without reserve in spite of what others may think, and strive to fight manfully the monstrous wrongs the majority party are trying to fasten upon us indefinitely. denounce this so-called prohibitory law as fanatical, un-

American and dangerous. Dangerous because if one set of cranks can take away one of our personal rights another set can rob us of another, and in proportion as cranks increase our liberties will decrease having in a measure arisen above the incubus of the priestcraft and ignorance of the past, let us not be dragged into a worse condition than the one we have left. I fear for the stability of the government if we continue to legislate for the benefit of the rich and the strong against the poor and the weak.

This looking down of one class upon another, is getting too common and is disturbing the relations which once existed. During the last few weeks I have heard the poor man discussed and measures proposed to better his condition. It is thought by some that the parks which the electric railroads are establishing to amuse the public should be discontinued because some poor, hard working man had actually been known to spend 10 cents in car fare to go to a free show, that he ought to save his 10 cents toward paying his dog tax. Another says he ought not to be allowed to own a dog. He ought to give his 10 cents to the King's Daughters to help them make paupers for the town to support.

Though perhaps his dog is the only thing in the world that he loves or that loves him. Jeremiah Hacker, a free thinking Quaker, who once edited and published a paper in the city of Portland, called the *Pleasure Boat*, made this prediction which it seems is near coming true. In denouncing a city ordinance that affected the poor, he said that they soon would not allow a poor man to have the itch for fear he would take some comfort scratching.

We have in this country as near as possible compulsory education and where there is education there will be thought and where there is thought there will be seeking after truth and truth makes us free. It is gratifying to know that some of our higher institutions of learning are seeking after the truth and are giving our sons and daughters the benefits of their research. Let us not heed the hypocritical snivelings of these pinchback reformers, but

seek after truth and follow it, and by precept and example strive to save our country from the dangers that threaten it. The same causes that caused the downfall of Greece and Rome and brought on the revolutions in England and France will do the same bloody work here, if this kind of legislation is continued until it becomes unbearable. We have as a nation proved to the world we were capable of gaining our liberty and independence. Let us show to them that we are able to retain it without bloodshed. You may think me a pessimist, but in sincerity I believe the signs of the times betokens ill to our country, and I make this as a prophecy and hope you will remember it as I don't expect to be here when the crash comes to say I told you so.

I have voted against prohibition and in favor of resubmission at every opportunity that has been afforded me, I voted against it in the first place because it seemed to me it interfered with the personal rights of free American citizens, believing that all persons however humble had an inalienable right to eat and drink whatever they pleased, even toad stools and wood alcohol if they wanted to. I take it for granted that all Democrats will vote for resubmission, it is more uncertain how the Republicans will vote as they seem to be in a quandary. The cranks are telling them that if they vote for resubmission their party will go to the wall, and the sane sensible men in the party tell them they are lost if they don't. There are two horns to the dilemma, gentlemen take your choice, I await with equanimity your choice as it seems by your own showing that either heads or tails wins for the Democrats.

I have been called down by some of my friends for calling this, so called, prohibitory law, a humbug, but until I find a more fitting name I shall continue to call it the monumental humbug of the age, and the fanatical men and women who clammer for its retention after it has proved to be a complete failure are not only humbugs, but disagreeable nuisances and a menace to a republican form of government. I deny the moral right of the legislator to refuse the resubmission

of this or any other law to the people for their approval or disapproval. As a law abiding citizen I am willing to be governed by the majority of the legal voters of the State, but I am not willing to be forever kept in doubt as to whether it is the will of the majority or not.

We have seen this House crowded to overflowing with men and women who think they have been commissioned of God to regulate other people's affairs, striving to influence the members of this House to prevent this matter going to the people, they quote Scripture and tell us that Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden fruit of the Garden of Eden and became wise knowing good from evil, and for that reason were driven from their Paradise and became the progenitors of all the human race. Now admitting this to be the fact, let us examine this matter, God being all wise, all powerful, and having fore knowledge, must have known just what his own created beings would do. He placed in the garden a tree of knowledge of good and evil, intending they should eat of its fruit and become wise, and to make sure they would eat of it, He put a prohibition tag on it and proclaimed it prohibited and that did the business. Tell any of Adam's race they shan't do a thing, and that is about the first thing they will want to do.

These modern self-styled reformers have discovered that God made a mistake in creating man a free moral agent, and are trying to improve upon His plan by placing sheriffs and Sturgis commissions around their forbidden fruit, to prevent people from exercising their God given rights as free moral agents.

God is the same yesterday, today and forever, and human nature is the same as it was in the beginning, and prohibition fruit is just what the ordinary man wants and what he will get, and no law will prevent it. The old Washington societies did all the good that was ever done in this State towards promoting temperance, and when moral suasion was dropped and the law depended upon to do the work the good work stopped. Now the same

spirit that influenced Adam is influencing his descendants to drink the juice of the forbidden fruit and they are bound to get it law or no law, you may be able to make it cost them a little more, if that is an object, desirable, but they are sure to get it, and it is up to us to decide what is best, under natural conditions, to do with the matter.

Nobody denies that drunkenness is an evil and a curse. And a man who drinks to excess injures himself his family and the community in which he lives. But the man that has an unquenchable thirst for liquor whether that thirst is inherited or acquired is an object of pity rather than one to be despised and outlawed. Some of the finest intellects in our country have been cursed by this uncontrollable thirst for drink. As a general rule you will find these men remarkable kindly and generous, and that in most cases is what made them drunkards, there are many temperate people who would have been drunkards if somebody else had bought the rum. Now don't let us imagine that we are so much above the drunkard because our meanness or some other nobler gift of God has prevented us from being drunkards.

Why should we longer authorize and arm with clubs broken down ministers and their unthinking followers to try to pound religion or temperance into their less fortunate but more worthy brethren?

It cannot thus be accomplished the plan has been fairly tried and has failed. Reformation must proceed from within it can never be forced into a man by arbitrary course.

This prohibitory law has almost destroyed the law of love and kindness, and weakened the respect for the law, and law makers, while these goubs are still on the war path chasing a myth and squandering the peoples hard earned money worse than uselessly.

God save us from the curse of fanaticism in all its forms.

The doings of one set of cranks nestled on a sand hill in the town of Durham, has been brought to the notice of the Governor praying that if it is with-

in his province to to abate the nuisance.

I have no doubt of its being a nuisance, but they do not meddle with other people's business as these Prohibition nuisances do, and they do not come here to ask us to legalize and aid them in their nuisance. There seems to be no limit to the arrogant audacity, and folly of all fanatical cranks.

I have had the opportunity to visit the Soldiers' Home at Togus. I saw those old men sitting around with bowed heads, their bent forms, gray hairs and wrinkled faces seemingly awaiting the end. Some crippled in the War of the Rebellion, I thought to deprive them of the innocent pleasures of the canteen, was the refinement of cruelty, and about the limit of unreasoning fanaticism. It seems to me that it is time that these meddling cranks should stand aside and let the people manage their own affairs, but some of them won't stand aside when cripples can get \$3 a day for being cranks and spies, making false arrests for the small fee, and acting as swift witnesses.

In my opinion, a majority of the people including many Prohibitionists desire to have this matter resubmitted, and the persistent refusal of the Republican party to resubmit has produced a feeling among the people that that somebody is trying to force upon them an obnoxious sumptuary law against their will.

I know of some life-long Republicans being dissatisfied with the ring who manage affairs and refused to go to the polls last fall to vote what they called the Prohibition ticket and petticoat government. Now my Republican friends I perfectly understand your predicament and sympathize with you. You have been playing the game of follow your leader and he has led you into a bog from which you have barely escaped, and if you follow him two years more you will be mired beyond extraction. You have been dabbling in Prohibition stocks and have sold short on a bull market, my advice to you is bolt your leaders and vote for resubmission. I know not how they will decide the question, neither do I care but we should all of us accept the voice

of the people as final, at least for a season.

The tendency seems to be to become our brothers' keepers. We take it upon us to look after other people's morals while our own need looking after. We were all born free and equal in so far as the pursuit of happiness is concerned. If some of us were not born with a gold spoon in our mouths, the world is supposed to be growing better, people are beginning to think for themselves, and are not so much as formerly bound down by sectarianism and led by office-seeking politicians and I certainly think this standing pat on resubmission and protection with trust subsidies added will be the last straw that will straighten the back of the Republican camel.

Democrats are not office seekers. All that kind of Democrats went over to the Republican party and got what they went after; and I admonish my fellow Democrats stand to your guns and boldly face the enemy. Never let it be said that we were wounded in the back. Never mind their calling you rummy and other pet names, as I have an encouraging message from the Master for you. And here it is:

"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for great is your reward. Ye are the salt of the earth. Ye are the light of the world."

If you Democrats are not in line for that blessing I don't know who are. So stand fast for justice and equal rights, and if you fail let it be said of you as was said of the woman of old:

"She hath done what she could."

The Medes and Persians of the Republican party claim great credit for standing pat against resubmission claiming that the last generation had a right to make laws to bind this one and this one has a right to keep them intact to bind the next one they seem to think that this obnoxious law is of Divine origin too sacred to be submitted to the sovereign people. I happen to know something about its origin, and you may take my word for it that it was anything but a Divine inspiration that put it on the statute books. The Republican party is standing pat on many vital questions. Standpatism if



persisted in is the rock on which the Republican ship will be foundered. We live under a Democratic government where the majority are supposed to rule and one generation has no right to pass laws to bind the next generation. Moses was the only law giver whose laws were supposed to be unchangeable but these modern Moseses and Elias that are springing up like toadstools in a night, claiming that the mantle of one or the other has fallen on them makes us almost doubt the genuineness of the original.

We have got to take man as we find him today. It is useless to speculate about his origin or his destination. We find him endowed with appetites and desires common to all, and the same intelligence that caused his existence and gave him these appetites, also provided abundantly the means for their gratification.

Man is a free moral agent and has a common right to all the provisions that nature has made for his comfort or pleasure. The abuse of any and all these natural gifts carry their punishment with them. If he is deterred by the sure punishment of natural laws he will not be restrained by human laws intended to rob him of his personal rights. Such legislation only strengthens his determination to throw off the injustice.

The Republican party is with difficulty, dragging around after it an abnormal protuberance which may properly be called a tail; an appendix of prohibition and protection. This prominent member has been pierced by the enemy and the wound has matterated and is discharging profusely its corruption and if a skillful operation is not performed and that right quickly the wound will prove fatal.

Now I am going to tell you a little story to illustrate the danger of too much tail. Many years ago there was an old-fashioned minister that used to tramp through the towns of Cumberland county.

He had but little acquaintance with books but claimed he had had a call from God to preach the everlasting gospel.

He would hold forth in the school

houses and the small churches in the districts where the people believed that the less a man knew about this world (if he had been called) the more he knew about the next and believed he had no need of writing his sermons; indeed it was sinful to do so, as he had only to open his mouth and God would fill it.

All his sermons were practically the same, and always told with great apparent satisfaction the story of the dog and the rabbit. On one of these occasions he had progressed to the part which he evidently thought to be the climax. He with great unction described the blessedness and safety to be found in the "hole in the rock yonder." He depicted the dog pursuing with murderous intent the rabbit which was fleeing for his life, and the rabbit discovering a hole in the rock, made for it in hot haste, the dog close at his heels. Then the preacher raised his voice and shouted: "Just as the dog was going to grab the rabbit by the tail the rabbit dodged into the hole in the rock and was saved, yes saved brethren." Then with an extra pound on the Bible exclaimed: "Blessed be God for that hole in the rock yonder." Stopping to mop his brow with his big bandanna, and while his audience were trying to apply the simile to their own condition, an old man in one of the back seats arose and shouted: "Elder that air rabbit had no tail, and that is what saved him."

Now my Republican friends, I advise you to get rid of your tail somehow. It hinders your running and is a fine handle to grab hold of, and then you may possibly gain that hole in the rock and be saved, instead of going to the dogs. (Applause.)

On motion motion of Mr. Johnson of Waterville,

Adjourned to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

#### Afternoon Session.

The Speaker appointed on the committee under the order relating to the procedure in the matter of the investigation of Judge Chapman of Bangor, Messrs. Smith of Patten, Johnson of Waterville, Hadlock of Cranberry Isles, Dyer of Buckfield, Dunton of

Belfast, Stearns of Norway and Dow of Brooks.

Mr. KNOWLTON of Monson: Mr. Speaker, in the discussion this forenoon there was a wide range of thought. We were led all the way from the Garden of Eden to Bangor. The question before us is simply the substitution of the minority for the majority report, and I cannot see how we can really act right without understanding the conditions. I am here as a member under this condition—in the caucus that nominated me I stated before the vote was taken that I was opposed to resubmission. Under those conditions I received 140 votes and there were 28 against me; so that I am sure in my vote against resubmission I represent the people that sent me here.

The remarks made hitherto have been mostly in reference to cities. There is something more in this great State than the few comparatively small cities. The people living on the hills and in the valleys constitute the great portion of the State of Maine; and I want to refer briefly to the people that I know.

I live in the county of Piscataquis, I have taught school the most of my life in the county of Aroostook, and I know those people, and I know that when I stand before you and say that I am opposed to resubmission I represent on the whole the sentiment of the people of Aroostook and of Piscataquis counties. It is an unmistakable fact that the country towns in the State of Maine are in favor of this law, and because they believe that it is for the best interests of the State, because they know that prohibition is a virtue and a success. In the county of Aroostook there is not a hotel today that is selling liquor. There are no rum shops up there. The people are in favor of the enforcement of the law and they want it to continue. A year ago especially it became known all over the State of Maine that the Democratic party were to change the prohibitory law if they came into power, and the Republican party was supposed to stand by it. At the last election a vote for the Republican party was a vote for prohibition. It was

not resubmission or non-resubmission. The essence behind it all was prohibition or license. So that today there is no dodging the question. Today we stand facing just the problem put before us by our Democratic friends. We come to the simple problem, is it license or is it prohibition? There is no dodging it, and I am ready to meet that issue by a straight-out vote.

The first thought that should animate this Legislature is what is best for the whole of the State—not one man but the whole people of Maine, our boys and girls and every individual in this great State of ours. I submit that there is no way to have civilization unless there be sacrifice on the part of somebody. Society is a compromise, the State is a compromise, and the only way a State can live and prosper is by compromise, by sacrifice, by one giving up something that another may be blessed. We only reach our higher civilization by sacrifice, and if individual man won't make it it must be made by the concensus of the better class. I stand before you with this proposition, what is best for the State of Maine, what is for the best interests of our boys and girls; and on that subject I feel as deeply as anyone possibly can. Associated all my life with these young people I can but feel that any vote on my part which would endanger the condition of things now existing would be a wicked thing. I wish simply to say to my own conscience and say to the people who sent me here that I propose to vote as I think it is best for the State of Maine. I propose to vote as my people want me to vote. I propose to vote so that I shall feel hereafter that I have done right. And while I believe in the people of Maine and would trust them to vote on any subject properly before them, I do dread to have the influence that would be brought to bear upon our State if we allow a free canvas of this matter. You know that there will be floods of money and rum poured into this State before that vote is taken by the people. I dread to see it. If the subject of simply referring this to the people could come up in its own virtue, without anything else associated with it, I would vote for re-

submission tomorrow. But our Democratic friends have put us in this condition, that it is virtually license or prohibition; and I for one, instead of taking one horn of the dilemma, propose to take the bull by both horns and hold him there. (Applause.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY of Camden: Mr. Speaker, I was sent here by a constituency made up largely of the dominant party, and about the last thing that they said to me before I came was that I would carry out their purpose in electing me and do what I could to bring about a resubmission of the prohibitory amendment. We all know that this matter has been a very vexatious one. The matter of prohibition started in 1837. The agitation began with General James Appleton. When that discussion started Maine was a growing and a coming State in all the departments of agriculture and industry. The people of Maine were a strong people, a resolute people, a brave people. That discussion started. How much it agitated the people we are not able to say now, but in 1845 it had progressed so far that a petition was addressed to the Legislature for prohibition. It did not meet with success that year but the next year it did. Here is the first prohibitory law, of 1846: "No person shall be allowed at any time to sell, by himself or his clerk, servant or agent, directly or indirectly any wine, brandy, rum or other spirituous liquors, or any liquors a part of which is spirituous." Now, with that prohibition, like the present constitutional amendment, there was yet the feeling and the knowledge that liquors were necessary for humanity and they put into that law a provision that certain persons in town were to be licensed to sell it for medicinal and mechanical purposes—just as our constitutional amendment is now. It was a law of 26 sections covering all the things that would be necessary to carry it into effect. In 1851 additions were made to the law. In 1853 all the laws were added to and fines and penalties of the severest kind were imposed. In 1855 still more stringent laws were passed in relation to it, 33 sections in all. It forbade patent medicines which had any intoxicating in-

gredients in them. Druggists could only keep it for compounding medicines. It went farther even than our own present law. In 1856 29 sections were added to the law. Physicians and druggists could compound medicines with spirituous liquor but not to contain enough for a drink. All these statutes from 1846 to 1856 were stringent laws. They comprised over 100 sections, more than our present law. Now, what was the result at that time? Men got liquor just as they do now. People were dissatisfied after they had tried all those laws. They found then that they did not have a prohibitory law, and in 1858 the present law was passed, or the foundation of the present law; and since that time it has been strengthened almost every year. In the past 25 years there have been 48 amendments to the law and the prohibitory amendment to the constitution.

That has been the history of prohibition. In all those years there never has been a year when the people of this State thought that they had prohibition. Talk about nullification of law—it is not the people who have nullified the law. The law has nullified itself. And what has been the result of it all? In 1883 the historian, writing on the history of prohibition, says the law had been a failure. That is the recorded history of the State of Maine in 1883. A more recent authority is the Governor of the State himself in his Portland speech last year when he said that for the last 25 years the law had been nullified. There is the history of it after all the time that has passed and with all this amount of law and prohibition, the historian in 1883 declaring that it had been a failure and the Governor of the State after doing all that was possible for mortal man to do, saying that for the last 25 years the law had been nullified. Isn't it time that something else should be tried? It is the part of wisdom to look for something else, and it is noticeable that at different times we have had practically the same law. Look over these laws and you will be surprised to see how generations have taken the same laws that have been repealed and considered of no use in the past. This is true with regard to the Sturgis law. The State constabu-

lary law was passed in 1867 and they were given the same powers in almost the exact language of the Sturgis law. That only lasted one year; it was plain to the people that it could not be executed in that way and it was repealed. In 1880 a law was enacted like this, that upon petition of thirty taxpayers in any county where the laws were not being faithfully enforced, the Governor should appoint two or more constables to enforce the law with like powers and duties as sheriffs and deputies. On simply the application of thirty citizens that could be done. Is there anyone here who can say that it was ever possible to get thirty people in a town to ask for that? And would you say that if it had been left to the people of the towns, they could have got ten people to ask for a Sturgis commission? Now that law was on the statute books from 1880 to 1901, and if those who enacted the Sturgis law had searched the statutes they would have found that this one had existed and that it was of no use and that it was impossible of enforcement. Then we had the Sturgis commission of 1905 and that has been a failure.

With that history in my mind I am ready to vote to resubmit this matter to the people, and with that in view I have no doubt that a discussion before the people if this can be submitted to them will bring about good results. It will establish a better feeling whichever way it goes, and men will unite to make the laws of this State such that people will be proud of them. (Applause.)

Mr. KENDALL of Bowdoinham: Mr. Speaker, The best sentiment of the State of Maine is strongly against resubmission because of the fact that prohibition in Maine has been such a success in the rural sections. In the past 20 years the newspapers in Boston especially would occasionally send a representative into the State here to write up prohibition. He would first strike Biddeford, and we know what he would find there, and then Portland, and then Gardiner, Augusta, Waterville and Bangor, and with the material that he would be able to get in favor of the failure of prohibition he would start for home, and that same routine would be fol-

lowed year after year, without any investigation of the success of prohibition in the rural portions of the State. We have about 20 cities in Maine and 480 towns, and it would seem as if the towns ought to have something to say in this connection. The conditions in Bangor have been referred to. It must not be forgotten that Bangor is the centre of a very large population. It is a clearing house, a distributing point. It is the largest city within five counties, comprising 250 towns and plantations. 213,000 people live within a radius of Bangor. If the country kicks violators of the law to the city, it is up to the city to kick them somewhere else. The same is true of Rumford Falls. The same thing applies to all the rest of our cities.

The gentleman from Bridgton asks why we have any objection to submit this question to the people. My answer is that we have no right to submit a moral question, and if the sale of liquor is not a moral question, what is? If this House should vote to resubmit how long do you suppose it would be before the organized liquor interests in New York city would know of it? And if we throw down the bars what is going to be the result? Demoralization, corruption, every purchasable vote in the State is going to be bought. Now for fifty years we have talked in relation to this particular matter. We are better known from the Atlantic to the Pacific on account of our prohibitory effort than from any other thing. It is true that the law has not been properly enforced. But it is always darkest just before day. In every walk of life a man has got to persist and to fight before he comes out victorious, and the harder he fights the more glorious will be his success when success comes. I firmly believe if this question is not resubmitted that between now and two years from now the clouds will break away, because no man and no people and no nation ever failed to be successful that followed the handwriting on the sky when there was a question of moral right involved, and held right sharp straight cut, for that point; but the person or the nation that cowers before any moral question and takes any backward steps,

“mene, mene, tekel, upharsin,” is written over their doorway.

It is said that prohibition does not prohibit. The State of Maine has about the same population as the city of Boston, and let anyone take the area in square miles and the population of Maine as against the population of Boston and then let him say whether prohibition here is a success or not as against license there. There is an immense amount of material to be considered in relation to this matter, but I return to this, that in company with my friend from Monson (Mr. Knowlton) I want to reiterate that this is a great moral question, and how we, as intelligent legislators, can view a great moral question in any way except to enforce it and to follow it up and never surrender, is more than I can understand. (Applause)

Mr. JOHNSON of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be in order for gentlemen who rise to address you to announce the obligations they are under to their constituents who by their votes have elected them to this House. I do not deem it necessary for me to follow the custom in this respect, but for a moment I will allude to it. I represent what we call and what to me is indeed a beautiful city, a city of a college of learning, a city of manufacturing, a city where the whirring spindles give employment to thousands of laborers, a city of as intelligent people as can be found anywhere in the confines of the State of Maine or anywhere within this Union, citizens who are capable of passing upon moral questions. That city—and it has operated for her prosperity—is evenly divided between two political parties, although that city was so close that two years ago when I came to this House I came with a Republican representative from that city, and I coming here by but a few notes over my competitor, this last fall I came here with a majority of over 500 from that city of Waterville due largely to the position which I had taken upon this very question; and my support did not come from the liquor interests of the city of Waterville. I agree with my friend from Bowdoinham that this is a great moral question. It is too

large a question to be made a question of party politics. It is a question which ought to be considered broadly and wisely. But as a moral question we are in the same position upon this as upon many others in the history of the world. Did you ever know of any great question which is a live question being discussed as this liquor question is in every state in this Union, demanding a solution of the evils which follow the use of liquor and its sale—did you ever know it to be settled right by shutting it up and putting it away in a constitution or anywhere else and saying to the intelligent people of a State, “You shall not deal with it, you shall not discuss it?” (Applause.) You cannot settle it that way because it is a moral question and one that is appealing for solution. The Pharisee in the past drew his cloak about him and said “Thank God, I am not as other men are.” He had settled the question; it was not open for discussion. And so others have tried to settle the question and have said there shall be no future discussion. Isn’t that the attitude in which we are forced here in this State?

I am no sudden convert from the city of Waterville to the question of resubmission. In 1888 in old Granite Hall in this city I attended my first political convention. Being appointed upon the committee on resolutions I advocated then a resubmission of this constitutional amendment. I had voted against it in 1884 when it meant something of ostracism at the time. I know how that constitutional amendment went into the constitution, and so do many of you, gentlemen,—when the temperance people and the ladies crowded the polls and it was almost an impossibility for a man to get a “no” ballot to vote against it, and if he did vote against it he was put down as a rummy, or ostracised. It was that feeling that kept many from recording their votes at that time. Now when I went into that committee on resolutions in 1888 I offered there a plank in favor of resubmission. That plank was voted down by a vote of nine to seven. I remember the majority of that committee announced the platform of the Democratic party and it began with these words, “We denounce

the Republican party for its hypocrisy in dealing with the liquor question." I presented a minority report and I said these words, when I opened, "Gentlemen, before we denounce the Republican party for its hypocrisy hadn't we better look around our own household and commence here and set ourselves right upon this question?" I need not say here that for the great Republican party in the State of Maine I have unstinted admiration, and yet speaking to you not as members of the Republican party or any other but as members of the 73rd Legislature, you know that the Republican party have put into their platforms that same statement, their advocacy of the prohibitory law, and then openly countenanced its violation and nullification. It was that which called my attention chiefly to the need of having the people take up this question again. In 1892 the Democratic party inserted it in their platform, and I ascribe to my friends and myself something of the credit for having placed it there, because I felt as I do now that this was a question which ought to be submitted to the people of the State of Maine, that it had no business in the constitution of a State, that it had nothing to do with organic or fundamental law, that a great moral question like this should be left where it could be dealt with by the Legislature of a State, by the people, and regulated; and it will have to be, Gentlemen, sometime.

I am not here to discuss license versus prohibition. If you submit this question to the people and if it were adopted you would have behind the prohibitory laws of this State all the numerous statutes which have been enacted. You would not have voted for license. You would have voted simply that it has no place in the constitution of the State. Who is there in this House that does not reverence and revere the constitution of the State? We ought to revere and love it. There should not be in it a law which will be violated; and none of you, gentlemen, and my prohibitionist friends, will tell me that in the future any more than in the past you can promise me that the prohibitory law will be enforced. The most that you can say to me is

the best way to regulate it. We cannot stop it, it is going to be here. We are only going to regulate it in this way—just keep it in the constitution and have the constitution of the State of Maine trampled in the mud and mire of being violated as you know it is going to be. You know it from past experience and you don't expect that it will ever be enforced. (Applause.)

It is idle to talk about confidence in the people when you say that they shall not have a part in the solution of a great question like this. You cannot say that we settled it in 1884 when we tucked it away in the constitution and you told us that it was all settled, that we had done away with it at once and forever. I believe it is a question that should be left to the Legislature to the Legislature to handle. And I am free to say that I don't know how I should vote if I came to a Legislature charged with the duty of regulating the liquor traffic. I should look the ground over carefully, learn the experience of other states and cities and see what could be done. But for what we have had in this State of Maine I can only blush—the trampling upon the constitution of the State, keeping it there when you know and will admit that it will not be enforced. I say there is a demand for its resubmission. Take the vote in this county of Kennebec last fall, not only in Waterville and in Augusta, but outside in your farming towns where the issue was largely this very question. And again is it a law that is satisfactory when you are compelled to create a special commission and say that you cannot trust the duly elected officers of a State to execute this law; that you cannot trust the mayors of cities and the police officers of the cities of Maine?

If it has been working well, if it is what the people of the State of Maine want, why the necessity of that unusual machinery to execute it? Take that alone as a demand. The way the Republican voters regarded the Sturgis commission and the votes of the cities where they operated show that you did not have behind this law the public sentiment that a law should have behind it to make it a successful law.

That is sufficient to my mind to show the necessity of having this question submitted to the people, and I will say to my friend from Bowdoinham that I have faith that the people of the State of Maine will withstand any importation of the liquor of rum trusts or of money. I have faith in the intelligence, the virtue, the patriotism of the citizens of the State of Maine that makes me confident of the triumph of their wishes and that they will see that they are not overcome and that their virtue is not debauched. (Applause.)

Mr. STUART of Belgrade: Mr. Speaker, There are a few I believe of the Republican members of this House who will vote to substitute the minority report of this bill for the majority. I wish there were more. Now in this House this morning. The few of us who will vote for resubmission were called anything but good fellows by the gentleman from Brooks. Mr. Dow. Now I would like to inquire what the fundamental principles of the grand old Republican party were when it was organized more than a half century ago. Did those principles stand for a minority rule by the few, or did they stand for the rule of the people by the people. We believe they did and do today. the gentleman from Brooks notwithstanding. Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.

Now then inasmuch as we believe as a sufficient number of the voters of the State have signified their desire to vote on this question are we 182 members of this House and Senate elected.

By the voters of this State coming to this Legislature and saying to the voters of the State, you go back and sit down, we cannot trust you to vote on this important question, we and we alone know what is best for you. Is this in accordance with the principles of the old Republican party. I deny it.

I believe the temperance party is not working for the best interest of temperance in this State. If we stop to read between the lines, to read the handwriting on the wall, we shall see that resubmission is and has been for some time gaining ground and

is sure to come and that the sooner it comes the better it will be for the prohibitory law. In other words, if this question had been submitted to the people two years ago they would have endorsed the present law, but the longer it is put off the less the chances will be to retain it. Now I am a Republican and have always been one. I believe in the principles of the old Republican party. I also believe as did one of the greatest statesmen of his day and the greatest statesman this State has ever raised, a man who lived under the shadow of this very building, the late James G. Blaine, in discussing this question, he says, keep close to the people; let them by their legislative representatives deal with subjects of this kind, and not tie them up by the constitution. (Applause.)

Mr. POWERS of Houlton: Gentlemen of the House, I should feel that I was not exactly doing my duty to my constituents did I allow this occasion to pass without recording something besides my vote in favor of the prohibitory law. (Applause) The gentleman who moved to substitute the minority for the majority report has placed the question clean cut for every Republican in this House when he said that a vote for resubmission meant the condemnation of the prohibitory law. And I agree with him that a vote for resubmission here today means the condemnation, as he puts it, of the prohibitory law. Gentlemen, I believe in the prohibitory law. I believe that it is the best law that was ever placed upon our statute book for the restriction of the liquor traffic, and I would keep it upon the statute books of Maine forever. (Applause) But, gentlemen, on this question I want to address myself to the Republican members of this House. I do not expect to win over one voter who is here elected by the Democratic party; but I should feel badly to see Republicans, who are sent here by Republican votes, go back on the men who sent them here. (Applause) Dickens makes one of his characters say, I think it was Captain Cuttle, to little Walter: "Don't go back on them as brought you up by hand." I say to you Republicans, don't go back on the men

who sent you here and vote against re-submission. It has been said that there was nothing that occurred in the convention held at Portland which would require Republicans to vote against resubmission. I was a member of that convention. There were present 1301 delegates out of a possible 1440. There were no contests on. No man came there the hiring of anybody. His bills were not paid except by himself, and they came from all over this State of Maine, from Fort Kent to Kittery, and, gentlemen, they came there for a purpose. And what was it that brought them there? Was it to see Governor Cobb re-nominated? No. It was as well known that he would be re-nominated before the convention as it was afterwards. It was this: It had been reported by the Democratic press that there would be an attempt to put into the platform a plank in favor of resubmission. The Republican press also had hinted at the same thing, and all along this Maine Central Railroad, starting at Bangor and stopping at Portland, through this valley of the Kennebec, in all the cities and all the hotels, at Lewiston and Auburn, everywhere this same thing was talked; and those men were there for a purpose, and that purpose was to vote against resubmission. (Applause) We were there assembled in that convention and after listening to three able speeches, one from a gentleman from Augusta, another from a gentleman from Androscoggin county and another from a gentleman from Bangor—after listening to three able speeches in favor of resubmission and one short speech opposed to it a vote was taken in that convention and about 60 men voted for resubmission and between 1200 and 1300 stood up like a wall opposed to it. (Applause) Something was done in that convention to say to the people of Maine that we were opposed to resubmission. Would it have been any stronger had we put a plank into that platform that we were opposed to resubmission? No, gentlemen, it would have been no stronger. We voted there, and there was enthusiasm in that convention. Hats went into the air, canes were swung and cheers were given at the time that vote was taken. It was

not a cold, perfunctory thing. It was something to be proud of to be present on that occasion; and yet I have heard it stated in this House, I have read it in the papers, that there was nothing which occurred in that convention which required us to vote against resubmission.

The gentleman who moved the substitution of the minority for the majority report says that the law cannot be enforced. Six years ago in my county there were 57 licensed rumsellers, besides all the others who were not paying any United States licenses. In 1902 we elected a sheriff who said he would enforce the law and he went at the business of enforcement; and while I live in a county 200 miles long and almost as wide, a county where enforcement of the law is difficult, at the time we voted for Governor in 1904 there was not a United States license in force in the whole county of Aroostook. Will you say to me that you cannot enforce the law? I say, gentlemen, that you are mistaken—honestly mistaken. And let me say that in 1905 there were only two United States licenses in that great county, and in 1906 there were only two. That is the way we have enforced the liquor law there. When I went to the village of Houlton to settle, there were more than 20 open saloons upon our streets, every hotel was selling rum and had an open bar and the drug stores were all selling rum. And how did it work? There were many poor children there. The ladies formed a society, and the men who had property furnished money to help clothe those children. Today that society has gone out of existence. There is no longer any call for one; there isn't a child there but what is properly clothed in that large village of ours, and is now attending school. That is what prohibition has done for us. Men who spent their earnings in saloons have saved money and have expended it upon their children and homes, and prohibition is what we want; and if resubmission means the destruction of the prohibitory law, God save us in that county. If resubmission means that, then I ask you who have said that you wanted to sub-



mit this question for the purpose of re-affirming the law, to vote against resubmission. (Applause).

All the counties of the State but five are here almost with a united Republican delegation because in my county and in those counties we have not been talking resubmission, we have not been talking against the prohibitory law, we have not said that it was a hypocritical law and that we were hypocrites, but we have been opposed to resubmission and in favor of the prohibitory law, and the result is that my county gives from three to five thousand Republican majority and these other counties are the same. (Applause). Are you going back to your constituents who sent you here with the understanding that you would oppose resubmission—for there was that understanding through this entire State that we as a party stood opposed to resubmission—are you going back and tell your constituents that you voted with the Democratic party upon this question? Why vote with them? It reminds me of the boy who was sent down to drive up the calves and got them all up but one. There was one calf that insisted upon following a steer and the boy tried to detach him from the steer, but every time the steer would turn the calf would turn also. And finally after the boy had run around the pasture three or four times, tried, disgusted and mad he said, "Gol darn ye' for a fool, you follow that steer if you want to but you will find out the difference when you come to want your supper." (Applause and laughter). I say to you, Republicans of this House, don't be misled on this question. Look around over this State and see how these counties stand. They are the counties which have not been discussing and talking resubmission. You hear that same talk in all these cities. Where are you going? Are you voting with the Democrats or are they voting with you? The Democrats have a plank in their platform that they are in favor of resubmission nad they are standing by it, and you men are going, you don't know where. It reminds me of an incident that occurred when I was

a boy on the farm in Somerset county. My father had a very unruly bull. There was a good old deacon there who allowed he could tame any animals but the Powers animals and so he came up one day to do it. I climbed a tree to see what was going on. The old deacon tied a rope around his waist and the other end around the nose of the bull and started in to chastise him. Pretty soon the bull started and the natural consequence was the deacon followed, and he was in the air about two-thirds of the time, and my father said to him, "Deacon, where are you going?" The deacon said, "Damned if I know, ask the bull." (Laughter and applause). I want to know where you are going. You want to know where you are going, you want to know where you are being led. The path marked out by our opponents will lead where it has always led, into the swamp and the jungles, it will lead to political dishonor and loss of self-respect. I want to feel, gentlemen, that wherever the Republican banner floats, there honor will follow and promises will be kept and platforms lived up to. (Applause.)

(At this point the Speaker resumed the Chair.)

Mr. Davies of Yarmouth, moved that when the vote is taken it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion to substitute the minority for the majority report. All those in favor of resubmission and in favor of the minority report will say yes as their names are called; those opposed to resubmission will say no. The Clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allan of Dennyville, Allen of Mt. Vernon, Allen of Richmond, Brawn, Brown, Copeland, Cyr, Davidson, Dondeno, Donigan, Duncan, Dunton, Edwards, Farnham, Flaherty, Frost, Gallagher, Harriman, Harris, Harthorn of Milford, Hibbard, Higgins, Johnson of Waterville, Jordan, Kelley, Lane, Leader, Leighton, Lowe, Lynch, Martin of Bangor, McClutchy, McKinney, Michaud, Minahane, Montgomery, Moore, Morneau, Mullen, Murphy, Newbert, Noyes, Perry of Randolph, Pike, Plakham, Pcoler, Preston, Scates, Skidmore, Skillin, Smith of Lisbon, Snow, Spear, Stevens of Jones-

port, Stover, Strickland, Stuart, Tarbox, Thomas of Harpswell, Tolman of Glenburn, Tolman of Portland, True, Tucker, Waldron of Fortland, Walker, Wardwell, Weld, Witham.

NAY—Allen of Columbia Falls, Baldwin, Barrows, Brackett, Charles, Chase, Clark, Cobb, Colcord, Crosby, Davies, Davis, Decker, Dow, Dyer, Emery, Farrar, Folsom, Fulton, Giddings, Gleason, Goodwin, Gordon, Hadlock, Hall of Caribou, Hall of Dover, Haskell, Hathorn of Detroit, Havey, Hawkes, Herrick, Hill of Machias, Hill of Monticello, Irving, Jacobs, Johnson of Calais, Joy, Kendall, Knowlton, LaBree, Langley, Libby, Lord, Loring, Lovejoy, Martin of Rumford, Mayo, Merriman, Merrill, Merry, Milliken, Newcomb, Oram, Peacock, Perkins of Alfred, Perkins of Kennebunkport, Perry of Fort Fairfield, Powers, Reynolds, Safford, Smith of Patten, Sprague, Stearns, Stevens of Portage Lake, Stubbs, Theriault, Thomas of Howland, Titcomb, Waldron of Dexter, Whitehouse, Wight, Wood, Young.

ABSENT—Barker, Blanchard, Emerson, Horgan, Newton, Putnam, Weeks.

Yeas, 68; nays, 73; absent, 7. Paired: Grinnell, yes; Danforth, no.

So the motion was lost. (Applause.)

On motion of Mr. Milliken of ~~Island~~ Falls, the majority report was then accepted.

On motion of Mr. Murphy of Portland, bill, to incorporate Cumberland County Power and Light Company, was taken from the table.

The bill was then passed to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Skidmore of Liberty, bill, relating to lime casks was taken from the table.

On further motion by Mr. Skidmore the vote was reconsidered whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Skidmore offered amendment "A" which was adopted, and the bill was then passed to be engrossed as amended.

On motion of Mr. Pike of Eastport, bill, relating to Eastport Electric Light Company and Pembroke Power Company, was taken from the table.

The bill was then passed to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Sprague of Drew Plantation, resolve in favor of Maria-ville was taken from the table.

Mr. Drew offered a statement of facts to accompany the resolve.

The resolve was then passed to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Skidmore of Lib-

erty, bill, for the protection of grey squirrels and black squirrels, so called, was taken from the table.

Mr. Skidmore moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Knowlton of Monson, Mr. Merrill of Monmouth, Mr. Dunton of Belfast and Mr. Stevens of Jonesport opposed the motion.

The question being put, the motion was lost.

Mr. Allen of Mount Vernon, offered amendment "A," by adding in the third line after the figures "1907" the words "except Kennebec county."

The amendment was lost.

Mr. Allen offered amendment "B" by inserting after the word "possession" in the fourth line the words "except alive."

The amendment was adopted, the bill was then read the second time as amended and was assigned for tomorrow morning.

On motion of Mr. Wood of Bluehill, bill, requiring steam plants in school buildings, churches and other public buildings to be in charge of competent persons, was taken from the table.

Mr. Wood moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The question being on the indefinite postponement of the bill,

On motion of Mr. Flaherty of Portland,

Adjourned.