ACTS AND RESOLVES

OF THE

FIFTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE.

1877.

Published by the Secretary of State, agreeably to Resolves of June 28, 1820, February 28, 1840, and March 16, 1842.

AUGUSTA:
SPRAGUE, OWEN & NASH, PRINTERS TO THE STATE.
1877.

ADDRESS OF

EX-GOVERNOR J. L. CHAMBERLAIN

AT THE CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 4, 1876, AND IN CONVENTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF MAINE, FEB. 6, 1877.

Two conspicuous headlands strike the attention of the European voyager approaching the North Atlantic coast. Reaching out boldly seaward they serve to mark the general direction of the shore, yet between them a vast expanse of water stretches to the north a day's sail beyond sight. These headlands are Cape Sable and Cape Cod,[1] whose outer lights range with each other about east-north-east and west-south-west, and are distant in a right line about 250 miles. Facing this line, at an average distance of 125 miles, lies the coast of Maine; fronted right and left by these two capes—great salients lying out like couchant lions guarding its broad approach. For, on their range a perpendicular from Cape Sable passes very near Eastport, the easternmost town of Maine; while a perpendicular from Nauset light, passing between Cape Ann and the Isles of Shoals, strikes not far from the city of Portsmouth on the Piscataqua river, which forms part of the western boundary of Maine.[2] These lines would enclose an almost regular rectangular parallelogram,[3] with a breadth one-half its length, but the figure is extended by two deep pockets, the Bay of Fundy on one side, and Cape Cod Bay on the other,—at the bottom of one, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and opposite, New Hamp-

[1] One can hardly help regretting that this name given by Gosnold (1602) has survived the more fitting designation given by Champlain and De Monts (1605),—Cap Blanc, White Cape,—a striking contrast with Cape Sable opposite. The Dutch also called it Witte Hoeck, White Hook. The Northmen had named it six hundred years before, Kialarness, Ship-nose. (Thorwald, Erik's son, 1002).

[2] U. S. Coast Survey charts. Atlantic, sheet No. 1.

[3] It was not this, but the Gulf of St. Lawrence probably, which Gomara (Hist. de las Indias) calls Golfo Quadrado, the Square Gulf. On the early charts this Gulf is represented as semi-circular, or the flat segment of an ellipse.

shire and Massachusetts. This considerable body of water, well deserving to be called a gulf, has in recent times received an appropriate name from the land whose limits lie so exactly opposite its great entrance capes, and is called the Gulf of Maine.[1]

This shoreland is also remarkable, being so battered and frayed by sea and storm, and worn perhaps by arctic currents and glacier beds,[2] that its natural front of some 250 miles is multiplied to an extent of not less than 2,500 miles of salt water line; while at an average distance of about three miles from the main land, stretches a chain of outposts consisting of more than three hundred islands[3]—fragments of the main—striking in their diversity,—on the west, low, wooded and grassy to the water's edge, and rising eastward through bolder types to the crowns and cliffs of Mt. Desert and Quoddy Head,—an advancing series from beauty to sublimity;[4] and behind all these are deep basins and broad river-mouths, affording convenient and spacious harbors, in many of which the navies of nations might safely ride at anchor.[5]

There is no doubt that the adventurous spirits of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were greatly drawn to these waters and shores, all the natural products of which offered themselves with primeval prodigality. One needs only to glance at the early charts,[6] or the wonderful stories of the voyagers of the times to perceive the romantic interest that centered here, and be prepared to understand why the great

[1] Edinburg Encyc., 1832, vol. XVIII. The name was first applied by Prof. J. E. Hilgard, of the U. S. Coast Survey office, and through his efforts it is likely to become permanent.

[2] Fiord valleys. Dana's Geology, 533.

[3] This portion of the coast may always be known on the rudest early charts by the dash of islands with which the explorers somewhat carelessly record their observations.

[4] "Advancing" only in the effect on human emotions; for in true rank I suppose the beautiful must be higher than the sublime, being the perfection and peace, where all the parts are obedient to the central law or soul of a thing; while the sublime overweighs the law and limit of perfection, and shows a power ready to pass out from the peace of its own being, and to threaten and destroy. Peace is higher than war.

[5] Somes's Sound is probably the most commodious and strategically advantageous position for a Naval Station for the United States on the whole Atlantic Coast. An effort was made to draw the attention of the Government to this in 1869.

[6] A very valuable collection appears in the interesting work of Dr. J. G. Kohl of Germany, "Discovery of the East Coast of America," Doc. Hist. of Me., Vol. I.

minds of that period attached such importance to the possession of this gulf, as if they foresaw that it must become the key to the Continent. Especially attractive was the region between the Piscataqua and Penobscot, in its marvellous beauty of shore and sea, of island and inlet, of bay and river and harbor, surpassing any other equally extensive portion of the Atlantic coast, and compared by travellers earliest and latest, with the famed archipelago of the Ægean.[1]

This was the objective point, not only of poetic fancy and dreams of Empire, but of the earliest actual colonies and settlements upon which more than one kingdom of the Old World based its title to the New.

Here, in the region about Pemaquid and Monhegan, were

[1] Thevet gave a glowing account of the Penobscot region visited by him in 1556.

Rosier, historian of Weymouth's voyage (1605), has among other lavish expressions of delight, the following comments upon a river explored by Weymouth, formerly supposed to be the Penobscot, but now thought to be the Sagadahoc. (John McKeen, Me. Hist. Coll. Vol. V): "As we passed with a gentle wind up with our ship in this river, any man may conceive with what admiration we all consented in joy. Many of our company who had been travellers in sundry countries, and in most famous rivers, yet affirmed them not comparable to this they now beheld. Some that were with Sir Walter Raleigh in his voyage to Guiana, in the discovery of the river Orenoque, which echoed fame to the world's ears, gave reasons why it was not to be compared with this, which wanteth the dangers of many shoals, and broken ground, wherewith that was incumbered. Others before that notable river in the West Indies called Rio Grande; some before the river of Loire, the river Seine and of Bourdeaux in France; which although they be great and goodly rivers, yet it is no detraction from them to be accounted inferior to this."—Mass. Hist. Coll. 3d Series, Vol. 8.

We must cite also a passage in De Peyster's Dutch in Maine, p. 44, "How few are alive to the glorious and varied beauty of that zone of islands which commencing with the perfection of Casco Bay, terminates with the precipitous seal-frequented shores of Grand Menan. Of all the archipelagoes sung by the poet, described by the historian, and depicted by the painter, there is none which can exceed in its union of charms those two hundred miles of intermingling land and ocean, where lost in each other's embrace, the sea seems in love with the land and the shore with the foam crested waves."

The beauty of this description is heightened for the love of German romance, by the association which calls up the passage at the opening of Fouqué's Undine, "Und es schien eben so wohl die Erdzunge habe sich aus Liebe zu der bläulich klaren wunderhellen Fluth, in diese hinein gedrängt, als auch das Wassar habe mit verliebten Armen nach der schönen Aue gegriffen, nach ihren hoch schwankenden Gräsern und Blumen, und nach dem erquicklichen Scatten ihrer Bäume."

wont to rendezvous the ships of many nations[1]—English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch and Italian—and made a strange company for the astonished senses of the too trustful aborigines.[2] The objects of these visits varied with national temper and habit, and also with the growing ambition of the times. First, a way to the Indies was sought; then gold; then fish and furs; then higher motives than trade prevailed, and noble minds conceived the great enterprise of bringing this fair land under the hand of civilization, and dedicating it to the good of man and glory of God. Here at length when the rivalry had narrowed down to two champions, the French and English made a bloody battle for empire.

Yet, this land, at first deemed so commanding in position, seems to have been at times strangely neglected. England, for nearly a hundred years, allowed it to pass from her thoughts. Even then, when stimulated by the enterprise of the French, her interest was fitful, and manifested chiefly by individual minds. As a nation she exhibited no strong policy towards these colonies. And when at length the settled institutions of civilization took shape and name here, this early favored region was unnaturally passed by. And it is only slowly, and even now but imperfectly, regaining its ancient and well grounded prestige.

The obscuration of its more recent career, the absolute and almost abject surrender of its name in history, is something singular. The minds of its own people seem to acquiesce in its loss of birthright with strange humility. Few know that it was the early settlements in this territory which confirmed the title of old England to the new;—that years before the Pilgrims set foot on Plymouth sands, there were established English settlements at various points on the shores of Maine;—that Pemaquid was a seat of trade and of government, and at one time the metropolis of all the region east of New York.[3] Popular history does not care to tell us that the Samoset who

[1] Winslow of Plymouth Colony, found thirty ships at Monhegan and Damariscove in his visit in 1622. (Purchas Pilgrims, Edition of 1625, Vol. IV.)

[2] It was a common practice of the early European ship-masters to kidnap the natives and sell them into slavery.

[3] The petition of the inhabitants of New Harbor, sometime before 1689, to the Governor and Council of New York concludes "And that Pemaquid may still remain the metropolitan of these parts, because it ever have been so before Boston was settled." See Pemaquid Papers, prepared by Dr. Hough, Maine Hist. Soc. Coll. V. 137.

startled the Pilgrims with the greeting, "Much welcome Englishmen!" was Lord of Pemaquid, and had learned the language from long familiar intercourse with the colonists and visitants at that joint capital. Nor are we told that when the heroic little band at Plymouth in that bitter winter, beset by enemies from all the elements and all the kingdoms of Nature, were driven out in search of food, it was hitherward the little shallop made its way, and found English hearts and hands, that helped to their utmost ability and would take no pay. Few are aware of the more important fact, that the colony at Plymouth owed its title and tenure, if not its origin, to those whose chief interest was here. It is not even a school boy's tale that the first incorporated city in America was within these limits—the city of Georgiana founded in 1641 on the site of the present town of York. It interests none but the antiquary to know that the Province of Maine was once a County Palatine, and is the only portion of American soil which was ever under a purely feudal tenure. How easily it is forgotten what men were William Phipps and those who manned the fleet that took Port Royal, or William Pepperell, and almost the entire armament which conducted the brilliant seige of Louisburg,—actions for which both these commanders were knighted by the sovereign. In truth, many of the issues in which this territory played an important part, have lost their vital relations with the interests that now absorb us. "French or English America," is now a dream of the past. "Royalty or Republic" no longer summons men to stake life and fortune on their choice. Churchmen and dissenter have sheathed the sword and laid aside the pen. The lines of loyalty are drawn by other tests.[1]

But even when the power of this province entered into the great struggle for independence, its service, its loyalty, its sacrifice, all were offered up in a name not its own, and are dead and gone out of mind, or live to swell the glory of others. Whose pride is now quickened to know that the first governor of Massachusetts was born in this Province,

[1] It is when free institutions are in process of formation that personal sacrifice ennobles history; afterwards these institutions are seized upon and made to minister to personal aggrandisement. Early ages are called heroic because of great deeds done to serve others; later times seem to reverse the process, and call men great who make others serve them.

and more than one other since;[1] that the first Secretary of War had his home by the Penobscot, and another resided on the bank of the Kennebec;[2] and that many of the best minds in the Congress and army of the Revolution were from this land without a name![3] Where is the record of the story once thrilling our youthful pulse, that when Washington rode down the lines to thank the troops whose valor had turned the tide of a desperate battle, and exclaimed with uncovered head "God bless the Massachusetts line!" he spoke to the Third Division—men from the counties of York and Cumberland?

It is indeed by a fatality of successive misadventures that Maine has been kept back in both her natural advance in wealth and population, and her credit for noble work in history, and that the earnest purposes which first broke ground here, have passed to bear fruit in remoter and even less remunerative soils. This rebound, or rather, if I may use the expression, this *ricochet* of civilization, cannot be readily accounted for unless we give to mere accident a place in determining human events, which neither the intellectual pride nor the religious faith of man is accustomed to admit.

It would certainly be natural that the shores along the Gulf of Maine which first seemed to foretell such glories to the minds of Europeans and attracted so many noble enterprises, should have been the theatre of the first and greatest exploits of civilization, and left lasting and wide and acknowledged results. Here, where the land stretches out its hands a hun-

[1] Sir William Phipps, born at Woolwich, 1651; James Sullivan, born in Berwick, 1744, distinguished also as a statesman and jurist; and John A. Andrew, born in Windham, 1818, whose character and services require no eulogy.

[2] Knox and Dearborn.

[3] Among others may be named John Sullivan, member of the 1st Continental Congress, 1774, and Major General in the Revolution, who afterwards saved New Hampshire from anarchy, and secured the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; Rufus King, orator, statesman and diplomatist; the Sewalls of York,—David, Stephen and Henry,—jurist, scholar and soldier—patriots all; the Prebles, father and son, Jedediah the general and Edward the commodore; the O'Briens, five brothers, famous and feared on the seas:—these names are a pride to Maine. George Thacher, jurist and statesman; Samuel Tucker, a commodore of no small renown; Peleg Wadsworth and Henry Dearborn, also generals in the army and members of Congress, though not born in Maine resided here, and their services are part of our history.

dred miles seaward, and holds them open by twice that extent to welcome the civilization of Europe to harbors and fields and powers so capacious, we should have looked for the emporiums of American industry and commerce, and the seats of influence and power upon the Continent. There would seem to be no reason in the nature of things why the sterile soils around Massachusetts Bay should have been taken up, while the rich lands of the east were left neglected, or why the meagre natural forces of southern New England should be overtasked with manufactures while the abounding and more available powers in the earlier discovered land should run wild and waste.

But after all it must be confessed that Maine has no history the dignity of which is conceded; and hardly a place among the recognized factors of the Nation's destiny. Those that are acquainted with her know full well that her inhabitants are behind none others either in physical or mental endowments, in character, intelligence, and independence, and thrifty and well to do style of living. But still the fact cannot be suppressed, that she is popularly spoken of as if she were a neighbor to the western savage,[1] rather than as she is, in time and place, and to no small degree in the arts of life, next neighbor to the culture of the Old World.

It is proper briefly to consider these two points, and if possible discover the reasons for this depression from her early promise, and this obscuration of her entire history.

1. First then a discouraging effect followed from the rigors of the climate, which the early European colonists had not learned to cope with. Such reports as that borne by the survivors of some winter-striken settlement, whose people had been spending all the warm season in random excursions or trading expeditions, that "the country is intolerably cold and sterile, unhealthy, and not habitable by our English nation,"[2] must have had the effect to turn aside many, the ardor of whose enterprise was not equalled by the hardihood of their bodies or the thoughtfulness of their preparations.

2. A second untoward influence is found in the strange

[1] One would suppose from the cuts in some of our popular geographies, that Maine was as yet almost an unbroken wilderness, the saw-mill and the scow being set forth as characteristic emblems of her advance in civilization.

[2] People who returned from the Popham Settlement, 1608.

accidents, the interruption of the elements and the opposition of human enemies,[1] which so often brought to nought the purposes of ship-loads and fleets of colonists, who had embarked for these shores.[2] The caprices of enthusiasm, superstition, ignorance, civil and religious dissensions—nay, more than once, and more than thrice, the death of a single man, changed the entire complexion and drift of those early affairs.[3]

3. A third source of discouragement was in the unsettled political condition, if that epithet can be applied to a state of things where there is no organized civil polity,—and the conflicts of jurisdiction[4] which from the earliest until almost the latest times of the provincial history of the territory, kept the colonists in constant anxiety, and held back many of those who hoped above all to bring to these shores the peaceful and civilizing influence of home.

4. Another and most effective disturbing force was the extraordinary severity of hostile attacks by the Indians, who took fearful vengeance upon the colonists for the outrages of roving ship masters. Their savage nature was also inflamed to unwonted zeal by the belief inculcated by the French Jesuits, that the English were not only their foes, but heretics and enemies of God. Then, again, from an imperfect understanding of the import and effect of title deeds[5] under which they had sold their lands, a bitter feeling arose that they

[1] "So that one must not wonder if the time be long in establishing of Colonies, specially in lands so remote, whose nature, and temperature of aire is not knowne, and where one must fell and cut downe Forrests, and be constrained to take heed, not from the people we call sauages, but from them that tearme themselues *Christians*, and yet haue but the name of it, cursed and abhominable people, worse than Wolues, enemies to God and human nature." Lescarbot (1609) Voyage of De Monts. Purchas, IV. p. 1627.

[2] The capture by the Spaniards of the first expeditions sent out by Popham and Georges, and the strange misadventures of storms and pirates and mutinies that befell Capt. John Smith's attempt to colonize New England in 1615 may be instanced.

[3] The revocation of the French grant to the Huguenot De Monts: The struggle between De Aulnay and La Tour in Castine for the mastery over Acadia: The death of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, of George Popham, of Chief Justice Popham, of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and even of Father Râles, are examples.

[4] See further on.

[5] Ownership to them conveyed no clearer notion than that of a right to hunt. There was no absurdity in granting this right to different parties, and this in their view would not exclude them from any rights they had before. They were slow to regard themselves as dispossessed.

were cheated and abused. For almost a hundred years such bloody scenes were enacted here, it is a wonder that there were any colonists left at all.

5. It must be confessed, that one great cause of the slow progress of colonization in this region, is to be found in the ruling ideas and motives of the times. This is true of the colonists. They were not men lifted up and held together by the thought that they were sufferers in a noble cause, and that their humble work took hold on higher things. They had not the austere virtues which are the foundation of States; they did not regard even the first truths of Political Economy, that wealth is only built up by labor, by bringing steady toil to bear upon nature, and that the means of commanding satisfactions are only to be attained through sacrifice and self-denial. Nor did the benevolent and noble minds in England, who had devoted themselves to these enterprizes realize the necessity of personal supervision and of actual contact with the raw materials and wild forces which were to be made servants to these great ends. You cannot build up a civilization with laws made three thousand miles away. Laws without personal, practical efforts, can no more construct society, than they can save it.

6. But even when something like order was established, and the powerful Colony of Massachusetts took this under its protection, no causes were set free to work any great changes for the better. It was natural and inevitable that the stronger should absorb the weaker. It could not be expected that Massachusetts would cherish the growth of Portland as a seaport, or make large investments to promote wealth and population in a territory which was not even adjacent, and which she could not but foresee, must in the natural course of events soon pass out of her hands.

7. The early colonists here were not of the creed and party which ultimately prevailed in the country, and this fact has had no small influence in obscuring this early history. The Huguenots, who were of the same faith as the English, were driven off because they were Frenchmen, and afterwards the English of the same blood were driven off because they were churchmen. The early colonies here held to the faith and forms of their founders. There was no reason why Massachusetts should embalm the memory of these men; nor

were the subsequent inhabitants of Maine in any great number their descendants. Hence there has arisen no champion to vindicate their claims, and no bard to sing their story.

8. The title to honorable remembrance which thus went by default, was still more effectually sunk by the fictions of eloquence, and the poetry of history. It seems a law of the mind, that whatever in human affairs is most impressive to the senses,—especially if it also appears decisive of results,—usurps the situation, and throws all subsidiary efforts, whether barren or fruitful, into a common obscurity. It is here the idealized picture of the landing of the Pilgrims, which, so true to character if not to fact, seizing upon men's minds has dwarfed our early history. It was Webster[1] first in his great speech at Plymouth in 1820, in commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims, who with the imagination, the passion and the touch of genius, created a history which like a new epic poem went to the heart of the world. This was perpetuated and confirmed by the finished oratory of Everett, and afterwards in the sober histories of Bancroft and Story. The gentle spirit of Mrs. Hemans caught the strain and echoed it back in divine song. No one was rude enough to break the charm—even if the rushing, hero-worshipping imagination of our people would have tolerated sober evidence. Our loyalty to the spirit of New England, our filial reverence for the Pilgrims, the constancy of the faith which was theirs and ours, our pride in the eloquence and our sympathy with the tenderness with which genius had lifted the story so high, made us unwilling to interrupt this lofty unity of effect with humble, homely truth. So, often does one's modesty make another's history. Doubtless in a high and noble figure Plymouth Rock is the foundation of New England; but still it is not true that New England was first settled in 1620, by the Pilgrims on the "stern and rock-bound coast" of Cape Cod Bay.[2]

I hold back no praise from the Pilgrims. No colors could be too strong, no eloquence or song too high to set forth the pictures of them which lives and beats in our hearts. It is power and inspiration; not only for this country, but for all

[1] This consideration is the suggestion of Mr. Poor in his Eulogy on Gorges, which is in many places too strong in its bearing.

[2] The Pilgrims themselves never claimed this exclusive honor. See Winslow's journal and Bradford's letter to Gorges, elsewhere cited.

mankind. Nor am I by any means pretending that the influence of the Maine Colonies upon New England *character* was comparable to that of Plymouth. But their influence on New England *history* has been of greatest moment. What is first in interest has absorbed what is first in time and in the logic of events, and so reduced the early history of Maine to absolute zero.

But lest it be thought from this review of evils that our early history has no worth, it is my purpose to present some aspects of it which could not be shown while enumerating the causes of depression. I shall no longer complain of neglect or injustice, but shall maintain positively the claims which Maine may justly hold to an important and honorable part in the fortunes of this country.

The subject naturally groups itself in two general divisions.

I. Maine as a Province: that is, controlled by powers outside of herself.

II. Maine as independent: making her own history, and in her own name.

The first of these divisions I shall discuss under three propositions:

1. Maine was instrumental in holding America for England as against France.

2. Maine was the historical beginning of New England, and not the daughter of any other colony.

3. New England, and especially Massachusetts, afterwards preserved Maine to the American Union.

Some of these statements may appear to have the merit of novelty. The task before me is to bring out their truth.

I am aware that history traces the acts of men rather than the fate of lands. But still, the land has much to do with man. It sustains a moral as well as a physical relation to him. 1st. It affects him through the power of association—memory and tradition. Whether life's toils and loves consecrate it, or whether it asserts its own claim as the theater on which we work out character and destiny, the land is dear, and remains so even when those who shared it with us have passed away. It is true, the great deeds wrought here in the heroic times were wrought by men whose descendants we are not. If we should seek to follow their footsteps, I know not what far off histories we should trace. But the land has a deeper interest and worth for the human hopes once fixed

here, and the earthly missions here wrought. It is mightier for the men that have passed away. Then, 2d, the physical features of the earth affect men, by a certain law of nature. Land and sea, and river and mountain abide. Nor do human hearts and needs change more. Here are elements of history which survive the shocks of arms and change of dynasties. Hence there is a certain continuity of life unconsciously passed down from age to age, even when not from father to son.[1]

I do not propose an epitome of historic facts. That were a tedious task. Nor does it suit the purpose to select critical situations to stir the imagination and emotions. We are to use the facts of this early period as related to their large consequence, and not as spectacles of human passion or endurance. But yet we cannot disregard the fact that the early history of this region is to a remarkable degree a history of men who have failed—a history nevertheless full of broadest purposes and noblest endeavor, and so not lost in the chain of human causes and effects.

A thousand years ago the eyes of Europeans were set upon these shores. Tradition has many a strange story of vessels storm-driven each way across the Atlantic in these latitudes—of strangers borne thus to the coasts of Europe, and of Europeans carried in turn to unknown shores, whence some one escaped to tell the marvellous story.[2] But some traces are verified in history. The two races which have been among

[1] Buckle, Hist. of Civilization, ascribes too much efficacy to this as controlling the destiny of nations. But sound thinkers and scholars, like Montesquieu and Sir Henry Maine, find in the land a powerful influence, as well as instrument, in determining man's advancement. The whole question is well handled in Mulford's Nation, chapter V.

[2] A Frisland fishing vessel was driven by a storm to a far western country named Estotiland, whose king had Latin books he could not understand, and who spoke no language resembling European tongues. He told the sailors of another country far to the south called Drogeo, a large country, "like another world," whose people were in eternal warfare; while farther yet southward were other nations more civilized, who built towns and temples. On the old charts this Estotiland (East-out-land) corresponds with Nova Scotia, while Drogeo is exactly in the locality of the State of Maine. See the sea chart of the Venetian brothers Zeni, made A. D. 1400; also, Dr. Kohl's note on Lelewel's map, p. 106.

The far famed Norumbega is first mentioned by a French captain in 1537 as including the territory now Maine. Quoted by Ramusio, Tom. III. fol. 423.

These wild names, full of weird associations, did not escape the ear of John Milton in his marvellous marshalling of sonorous names. See Paradise Lost, Bk. x. 686, 696.

the last though not now the least to mingle with us, were earliest of discoverers. To the Celts and the Scandinavians belongs this pre-eminence. Certainly, when the Northmen first took possession of Iceland, in 860, they found the Irish chieftains settled there. And it appears an unquestionable fact, that Madoc, Prince of Wales in 1170, had large dealings with these Western shores.[1]

But the Northmen meantime had turned their ships hitherward. Their story is no longer a myth, but strong and stirring history. The attempt of Erik's sons[2] to fix their homes and found a new Northland here, belongs to the romance of Rhode Island history. Leif's buldir—Leif's block-house, or bower—lives at least in song, and the "old windmill" still stands to tell of thoughts and deeds that have gone. But it was even within this Gulf of Maine[3] that Thorwald, also Erik's son, who had landed to seek a dwelling place, fought like a Viking and died like a Christian. After the hard fight he asked his comrades if any of them were hurt. When they answered No, he continued, "But I have an arrow under my arm. I was a true prophet. I shall indeed abide here and not depart. But bury me on the promontory, and plant there two crosses, at my head and feet." So they laid him, and named the place Krossaness—Cross-nose—Mount of the crosses.[4]

This endeared the land still more, and there came afterwards an earnest company, men and women, the latter leaders in spirit and purpose and courage,—with cattle and utensils and all things for goodly homes,—a hundred and sixty souls, in three ships, "keeping the shore close on the starboard hand," searching with loving, earnest eyes for the beacon of their hearts—Thorwald's Headland of the Crosses. What a romance might be written on "Thorwald's Cross!"

But all this passed. The land relapsed into the shadow,

[1] See Hakluyt's Voiages, London, 1589, p. 506.

[2] See Rafn's Antiquitates Americanæ, Copenhagen, 1837.

[3] In the year 1004. Probably at Cape Ann, or possibly still east of that. The fight was brought on by an unprovoked assault on the natives by some of the company.

[4] The new volume of the Prince Society, edited by Rev. E. F. Slafter, Voyages of the Northmen to America, containing the Icelandic Sagas of the same, comes to hand just as this passes to the press. The beautiful map of Vinland has Krossaness at Gurnet Point, the entrance to Plymouth harbor.

and for five hundred years was as an "undiscovered country." The voyage of that great spirit, Columbus, was indeed to an unknown world. But he did more than to bring new things to light. He joined the new to the old and half-forgotten. With prophetic gaze he saw the past and future in blending lines, and by the strong sequences of thought restored the continuity of history and the unity of human endeavor.

The English appear to have been slow to comprehend the great opportunities afforded by the discovery of America. The Spanish and Portuguese sovereigns proposed at first to share these benefits under the dispensation of the Pope.[1] But Francis I. of France had no notion of being left out in the distribution. "He would like to see the clause in Adam's will," he said, "which made this continent the exclusive possession of his brothers of Spain and Portugal." From that time France laid claim to the country north of Florida, for nearly a hundred years before England had pretended to any substantial claim. It is true the Cabots from 1496 to 1498 had discovered the mainland more than a year before Columbus saw it, and had explored the coast from Florida to Labrador; but so far was England from basing upon this any claim to jurisdiction, that we find the government nearly a hundred years after, laying down the broad and true doctrine that discovery without occupation does not confer title.[2] Far different were the thoughts of France. In 1524 Francis sent out Verrazzano, who explored the entire coast from the 30th to the 50th degree of latitude, and named the whole region New France. This substantiated a claim which France maintained, and Carolina was named after Charles IX. In pursuance of his plans of colonization the French Monarch sent out ten years later, Jacques Cartier, whose successive voyages, within the six years following, laid open the whole region of the St. Lawrence, stimulated the spirit of enterprise, and laid the foundation for those splendid dreams of empire which years afterwards the gallant King Henry of Navarre conceived, and the noble Champlain so nearly realized.

The high-minded Emanuel of Portugal had indeed commissioned the Cortereals, whose voyages in 1500 to 1502 ranged

[1] Bull of Pope Alexander VI., 1493.

[2] Prescriptio sine possessione haud valeat. Camden Eliz. Annales, 1580.

along our northern coast, and left at least many names on the charts of those waters. But no actual claim to possession followed.

The Spanish claim amounted to no more. Ponce de Leon seeking the fountains of immortal youth, roamed among the voluptuous islands of the Lucayos, and along the luxuriant coasts of Florida. But the longed-for fountains were still far away, and like others who seek for the joy of life, he lost life itself.[1] But it was Estevan Gomez, in 1525, who brought the Spanish flag into these northern waters. Tokens of his long sojourn and wide explorations are the Spanish names he left at so many points, and his own name long given to the Penobscot, whose glories he doubtless had rapturously described.[2] From his time the waters swarmed with Biscayan fishermen, but no real claim to jurisdiction was set up.

There was now a lull in these larger activities. For fifty years the spirit of adventure only prompted the French and English to take fish and furs along these coasts, and nobler enterprises seem to have passed from the minds of the governments of both these countries.

But there were some earnest minds at work meanwhile. Both reality and romance found plenty of material. In 1556 a French gentleman, André Thevet, gave an enthusiastic account of a visit to the Penobscot region, which is remarkable for its statements and suggestions. It thus begins:[3] "Here we entered a river which is one of the finest in the whole world. We call it Norumbega. It is marked on some charts as the Grand River. The natives call it Agoncy. Several beautiful rivers flow into it. Upon its banks the French formerly erected a small fort about ten leagues from its mouth. It was called the Fort of Norumbega, and was surrounded by fresh water."

John Rut and other travellers, English and French, visited

[1] A curious interpretation of this wondrous fountain is given in Parkman's Pioneers of France in the New World, p. 6, note.

[2] Dr. Kohl. Discovery of the East coast, 164, 276. On old Spanish maps this territory is called Tierra de Gomez, and the Penobscot, Rio de Gomez.

[3] See André Thevet, "La Cosmographie Universelle," tom. 2, fol. 1008, Paris, 1575. I have not seen this rare book, but rely upon the citations in Abbott's History of Maine, p. 29, credited to Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. VII, p. 243. The story is more fully told in Dr. Kohl's Disc. E. Coast, p. 415. It would seem that the French occupied the Penobscot long before Thevet's visit, three hundred and twenty years ago.

the coast of Maine the latter half of the 16th century, but without important results. In 1562 the great Coligny, Protestant admiral of France, had obtained a charter for his oppressed Huguenots, and attempted to establish them in the Carolinas under the leadership of Ribault and Laudonniere.[1] In 1598 the Marquis of La Roche attempted to found a Catholic and feudal empire on this northeastern coast of New France. His undertaking had other elements of failure. He landed at the dismal Isle of Sable. His colonists were convicts, worn out in heart and hope, and without even manly resolution. This is not the stuff of which even Church and State can build up a civilization. Coligny's enterprises were crushed by the inhuman cruelty of religious foes; La Roche's perished through lack of moral purpose. So disaster seemed to have followed all alike, and Huguenot and Catholic shared the depair.

It is a remarkable fact, however, that in 1574 a petition had been presented to Queen Elizabeth to *allow of the discovery* of lands in America "fatally reserved to England and for the honor of Her Majesty."[2] In 1578 Elizabeth gave a roving commission to Sir Humphrey Gilbert "for planting," she says, "our people in America;" and in 1584 a sort of general charter to Sir Walter Raleigh:[3]—two of the most accomplished men in England, and half-brothers in relation. Of Raleigh's heroic efforts and their failure in Virginia,[4] his noble bearing afterwards, and melancholy fate in England we know too well. Gilbert before him had established a little colony at St. Johns, Newfoundland, but its disaster soon followed his own. Returning from an exploration of these milder regions he encountered a terrific storm,—as some say, not far off Monhegan. Remaining resolutely in his little shallop of ten tons, that he might have no advantage of the very least of his companions, he buffeted the tempest with calm mind and skillful hand. For a time those in the larger ship saw his little light tossed on the midnight seas. Suddenly it was swallowed up

[1] See the interesting account of Ribault's new sailing course "to the honor of the French name" which led the way for Gosnold in 1602. Kohl. Disc. E. Coast, p. 425.

[2] Calendar of Colonial State Papers, Sainsbury, vol. I.

[3] See these charters, Hakluyt Papers, Folio Edit. of 1589, pp. 677, 725.

[4] The whole North coast was so named in honor of Elizabeth. It might be some compensation to the proud Queen, who was yet so thoroughly human, thus to emphasize and perpetuate that incident of her life which was doubtless her one great sorrow.

from sight, and nought was left of that great heart above the face of earth or ocean, but a sublime voice of manly cheer borne across the roaring storm,—"We are as near Heaven by sea as by land!" Heroic and pure soul: we doubt not he was very near.[1]

And so it all had ended. At the close of the sixteenth century these shores remained an unbroken wilderness, without a single European family from Florida to the frozen ocean. As for England, she had not a colonial possession on the globe.

But there now appear upon the scene two men of resolute character and commanding genius, unconscious rivals, full of mighty thoughts of empire, but lacking fit followers; both destined to fail of their immediate design, but both to live in the works that follow them.

To Samuel Champlain and Ferdinando Gorges belongs the glory of setting in motion the great powers that were to contend for the mastery of the New World.

Prompted by the brilliant operations of Champlain (under the auspices of a company of Rouen merchants), King Henry of Navarre in 1603 granted to De Monts, a Protestant gentleman and member of the king's household, a charter conferring the possession and sovereignty of the country from latitude 40° to 46°—that is from the latitude of Philadelphia to a parallel a little above Mount Katahdin and the city of Montreal. Champlain accompanied him on his voyage. His company was strangely mixed—"the best and the meanest of France"—noblemen and gentlemen, vagabonds and ruffians; Catholic priest and Huguenot minister, who, as Champlain says, "fell to with their fists on questions of faith;"—not a promising company surely for the hope of a new world. They established their first colony and spent their first winter on an island in the St. Croix river, now on the borders of the State of Maine.[2]

[1] "Then as he was refined and made nearer drawing unto the image of God; so it pleased the Devine Will to resume him unto himselfe, whither both his, and every other high and noble minde have alwaise aspired." Edward Haies' account of Sir Humphrey Gilbert's last voyage. Hakluyt, p. 697.

[2] Neutral Island: the identification of which determined the vexed question of our eastern boundary; "so this little spot (says Gen. Brown, paper on Champlain, Hist. Soc. Coll. vol. VII,) has acquired a National importance." See a vivid description of the search and discovery, Parkman's "Pioneers of France in the New World," p. 227.

Thus it was a French Protestant who first broke the vast and dreary solitudes of the Atlantic shores. This settlement was soon abandoned and another begun at Port Royal, which afterwards became permanent, now known as Annapolis, Nova Scotia; and a name was given to the whole region around, now consecrated in human sympathy and song by Longfellow's Evangeline—Acadia.[1]

It is impossible to trace within the limits of this discourse the various and energetic efforts by which the French settlements were pushed along our coast; although no chapter of exploration is more interesting than the voyages of De Monts and Champlain in 1604–5–6, and their careful study of prominent points, especially at Casco Bay and Saco;[2] or the settlements at Mt. Desert, and in the Pentagoet or lower Penobscot region, of which the headquarters were at Castine, a peninsular and promontory well befitting, in its picturesque and wonderful beauty, a history doubtless the most romantic of any in Maine; or even the subsequent forays upon the English at Pemaquid to maintain a show of claim, and the more effectual expedient of the missions on the Kennebec;—the French thus by actual occupation seeking to make the Kennebec the western limit of Acadia.[3] Nor does the occasion permit me to follow even on the wing the romantic career of Champlain, after the father of the great Conde as Viceroy[4] had brought his powerful aid to the cause, or that heroic and

[1] The suggestion of Abbott, History of Maine, that this name is from the Greek Arcadia is not good, historically or etymologically. R is too strong a letter to be so ignored. The art of suppressing it in speech is late and local, and it is to be hoped destined to be a lost art. The most reasonable conjecture as to the name is that it is connected with Quoddy. It first appears in De Monts' charter, and in the form, La Cadie. On the map of English and French claims in 1755, Passamaquoddy is spelled Passamacadie. Quebec also was spelled Kebec.

[2] Aucócisco and Chouaquoet. These written words are efforts to represent the sound of the Indian names. We cannot tell how to pronounce them until we know what was the language of the writer. This French spelling Chouaquoet show that our word Saco was, from the first, pronounced Saw-co.

[3] "The Court of France adjudged that they had the right to extend the limits of Acadie as far as the river Kinnibeque." French Commissioners, Treaty of Utrecht.

[4] Henry II. De Bourbon. He commissioned Champlain two days after his own appointment. Prof. Ridpath is in error, when in his excellent history he says this is the "great Conde." See Charlevoix, Hist. de la Nouvelle France. A splendid edition has been lately published by the distinguished historical scholar, John G. Shea.

wonderful missionary work along the great interior water courses—a work which more powerful than the might of arms, brought four-fifths of this entire country under the flag of France. For the matter now in hand it is enough to say, that for reasons then accounted valid, France had good pretence of claim to two-thirds of the present State of Maine.

I must balance the chief figures of the picture by setting over against this French charter of De Monts, 1603, the great English charter given by James the First, April 10th, 1606. This celebrated charter deserves a few words of introduction. In 1602, Bartholomew Gosnold, full of noble enterprise, set forth for the New World. Avoiding the old circuitous route by the Azores, and profiting by the experiment of the bold Huguenot Ribault, he stood straight across from Falmouth, England, very nearly to what is now Falmouth, Maine. Thence he passed on southward and made an earnest though unsuccessful attempt to plant a colony on the islands south of Massachusetts. The subsequent career of this able man belongs to the history of Virginia.[1]

The next year Martin Pring, under instructions of Richard Hakluyt, with the "Speedwell" and "Discoverer" followed Gosnold's track. He made the islands in Penobscot Bay, which he named the Fox Islands, and revelling in the grand scenery of those waters he passed on to the Kennebec, then amidst the beautiful islands of Casco Bay and up the Saco river to the falls. We may be very sure that glowing accounts of these explorations warmed a new interest in England.

In 1605, Capt. Waymouth, with the countenance and support of Sir Ferdinando Gorges and the Earls of Southhampton and Arundel, pursued the same course and object. In his superb ship the "Archangel," he came to anchor under Monhegan, whence he visited the mainland and explored what Strachey calls "the excellent and beneficial river of the

[1] The land-fall of Gosnold has been a matter of controversy. Strachey, who was a contemporary, says they made the "land about Sagadahoc." Brereton, a companion and historian of the voyage, says they named this the Northland, and stood off southerly into the sea, making land the next day,—which must have been Cape Cod. Archer, journalist of the voyage, confirms this, and adds the remarable incident that when they anchored under this Northland, eight Indians in a Biscay shallop, with mast and sail, came boldly aboard, some of whom were dressed in European clothing. This was in Casco Bay, May 14th, 1602. The evidence is well summed up in Poor's Vindication of Gorges, p. 30, note.

Sagadahoc," and afterwards it would seem the regions of the Penobscot.[1] The enthusiastic story of these explorations told by Rosier, the historian of the voyage,—whose name still rests on the bold headland south of Castine,—was the spring of new enterprises.[2] Even the wrongs Waymouth did were overruled for good. It was a base act, doubtless, to kidnap the natives; but he did it not for the infamous purpose—as so many others had done—of selling them into slavery, but that they might testify and illustrate the wonders of these new lands. Three of these were sent, rather as guests than gifts, to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, governor of Plymouth, who kept them for three years, both teaching and studying them, and thus making himself familiar with many things concerning the people and country. "This accident," says Gorges, "must be acknowledged the means under God of putting on foot and giving life to all our plantations."

Gorges now enlisted the sympathy of many of the most eminent men in England, among whom was Lord Chief Justice Popham, in the enterprise of establishing actual English settlements on these shores. The noble efforts of Raleigh had not passed out of thought, and the new project took a wide scope and double objective. The great charter of Virginia provided for two colonies, one under the London Company, to be between the 34° and 38° of latitude; the other under the Plymouth Company, between the 41° and 45°—or to speak more plainly, between the latitude of New York City and that of Passamaquoddy Bay, and the city of Bangor. As this latter territory lay wholly within the limits of the French grant and claim, it is easy to foresee what conflicts of jurisdiction, and what bitter struggles for mastery, when each party feels assured it is right, must vex and harrow this fair land.

Preparations were immediately made by both companies under this ample charter. Strange mishaps befel the ships first sent out to found the northern colony. And so it chanced that the first settlement was made by the southern colony at

[1] The exact route of Waymouth's explorations, and the locality of his "Pentecost Harbor," have also been subjects of investigation. His base of operations, however, appears to be the region about Pemaquid and Sagadahoc.

[2] This voyage was perhaps the immediate occasion of the formation of the famous Plymouth Company in England.

Jamestown, South Virginia, May 13, 1607. But on the 31st of the same month of the same year, set sail from Plymouth, England, two ships, "The gift of God," and "The Mary and John," with 120 persons, to plant a colony on these much sought shores. They were commanded by George Popham, brother of the Lord Chief Justice, and Raleigh Gilbert, son of Sir Humphrey and nephew of Sir Walter Raleigh—two as noble and gallant commanders as ever faced the dangers of the elements, or of man. "These frail barks were freighted with the best hopes, and anxious doubts of wise and earnest and noble men, who through the mists of coming times beheld a new world rising out of the dense forests behind these rocky ramparts." On the 17th of August, the little fleet having barely escaped destruction in a terrible storm on that dangerous lee shore, lay moored beneath the crests of Seguin "which pile their sheltering rocks seaward."[1] After careful exploration they debarked on the peninsula of Sagadahoc, at the mouth of the Kennebec, on the spot now commemorated by Fort Popham. They had brought their good minister with them, Richard Seymour; and with solemn ceremonies of prayer and sermon they dedicated the spot to civilization and themselves to God's service, and inaugurated their government. They worked right earnestly. First, they fortified the ground, and built a fort mounting twelve guns. Soon fifty houses and a church sprung up under their busy hands, and a keel was laid for a thirty-ton vessel, which was afterward named the "Virginia of Sagadahoc," the first vessel built on this continent by European hands.[2] It seemed as if this were an auspicious beginning for English homes. But troubles came down upon them. The winter was one of extraordinary severity. The death of their governor, George Popham, and the necessary return of Gilbert to England, left the colony without a head, and the members became disheartened and soon dispersed. Some of them returned to England, some went to Virginia, and some, there is every reason to believe, made their way to the neighboring regions of Monhegan and Pemaquid.[3] And so passed,—perished,

[1] Mr. Sewall's paper, Me. Hist. Soc. Col. VII. p. 299.

[2] The yacht "Restless," built near New York by Adrian Block, was built in 1614, seven years later.

[3] There is French tradition to this effect. There were English at Pemaquid in 1608–9. Relations des Jesuites, Vol. I.

shall we say?—the first organized English colony on these New England shores.[1]

The Maine Historical Society has of late brought this colony into much prominence,[2] and it is possible that local pride, together with the great respect still paid here to the English church, and possibly that generosity which accompanies the restitution of justice long withheld, may have pushed these claims to an importance which seems to disparage that of Plymouth as a political event. For my own part, I do not attach any great importance to the Popham colony as a fact seen only in itself. This colony indeed, as much as any other of that time, was full of the purpose and potency of civilization. It was deliberately intended and planned for men in their largest capacity and widest relations, with ideas of society and government and law and morality and religion. It was to be followed up by reinforcements as rapidly as they could be cared for. Not enthusiasts nor martyrs were our colonists, but they were prompted by some of the best blood that stirred in English hearts. Still, something was lacking of the elements out of which States are built. Certainly it was not high purpose nor devout feeling. Perhaps, as has been suggested, it was the absence of woman's brave and heroic spirit which made men's hearts succumb to sufferings and danger. Then, too, it is only the sacrifice of even the highest things in self for the sake of things greater than self, that builds any lasting institutions or wins any worthy rewards, even in this world. That lesson the colonist had not learned.

But there is another light in which to view this colony—a light that shines from across the sea, and is reflected back. It is the fact seen in its reasons and relations—its causes and effects—that makes it a power in history. As a political

[1] Strachey's account. Me. Hist. Coll. Vol. iii. p. 308.

[2] It is difficult to understand the animus which this claim has provoked in the minds of our good cousins of Massachusetts. Mr. Haven (Lowell Inst. Lectures, "Mass. and its early Hist." p. 141) calls this public meet- of the Historical Society at Fort Popham a farce, and speaks of the company as a band of outlaws; and afterwards repeats the charge, comparing them to the French felon company of La Roche at the Isle of Sable. The "farce" may be matter of judgment, but the "felon" charge is a question of fact. And it appears to be a distinguishing characteristic of this Sagadahoc colony above all others, that it contained no persons of this description.

event its importance does not wholly depend on the permanence and fixity of the colony. Even the unsuccessful attempts of Raleigh and Gilbert and Gosnold, were not without influence. But the Sagadahoc settlement subserved a far higher office in the history of New England colonization. It established the title of England, as against France, in the whole New England territory. In this regard the Government of England lifted this little colony into great importance. It is referred to in almost every instance of controversy as furnishing the very element which was essential to valid title, and which was hitherto lacking,—that is, actual occupation by settlement. The English claim was no longer barred by their own maxim, "Prescription without possession does not give title."

Nor must the critics of Maine's pretence to consideration among the forces that gave America to Englishmen, forget that this was by no means the only English settlement in this region on which good title to priority could be set up. It appears to me that our friends of the Historical Society have not availed themselves of all the strength of the case, in not making more account of the evidences of the substantial continuity of settlement in these regions, at an earlier date than that of any other portion of New England. This appears by testimony scattered through the records of that period. It is freely granted that after the disaster of the Popham colony there was no organized attempt at colonization for some time. But when other hearts were failing them, Gorges held firmly to the grand thought and purpose of his life. He never ceased to stir others to new efforts, and he kept up his own communications with this intractable new world. When nothing else would do, he hired people to live here. Moreover, the importance the English government constantly attached to the Maine settlements would seem to argue that they were something more than a single dispersed and abandoned colony. It would seem that the whole region between Pemaquid and Sagadahoc was a scene of busy enterpise, too shifting in *personnel* to be called in strictness settlement,—still, never wholly relinquished nor even languising, but such as it was, a bold and substantial beginning of settled life and home.

Prince (Annals, 117) says, two ships sailed from Sagadahoc December 15, 1607, with all their company except forty-five, for England. The statement is not precisely accurate, but still

contains valuable evidence. Only one ship sailed at that date, which returned with supplies, and *then* "two ships" sailed for England, as said above,—one of them, the "Virginia." If the colonists left in such numbers the first winter, President Popham would have mentioned it in his letters surely, and it would have been remarked upon at home. The statement that when the two ships left they took all but forty-five, is doubtless correct, but the two ships were the "Mary and John" of London, and the "Virginia" of Sagadahoc. What then became of the "Gift of God," and the forty-five men? Is there not a reasonable presumption that they betook themselves to the stronger position at Pemaquid, and formed the nucleus of these "scattered beginnings" so often, though obscurely hinted at in many records of that period, and which grew into the settlements known at the time of the arrival of the Puritans, at least comparatively well established and flourishing?[1]

Hubbard (in his narrative, p. 280) says, "after the attempt to settle Sagadahoc, *other places adjoining* were soon seized and improved for trading and fishing." He also says (Hist. New England, p. 40) that Dermer was employed by Gorges in 1619 "to settle the affairs of the Plantation now *a third time* revived again about Kennebec."

Prince (Annals, 209, 215) mentions the island of Monhegan in 1623 as a plantation of Sir F. Gorges, and afterwards the "scattering beginning made at Monhegan, and at some other places by sundry others."

Captain Levett made a voyage along the coast of Maine in 1623, to find a place for a plantation. He found Pemaquid already a mart of trade, and as he says this place, Cape Newagen and Monhegan were granted to others, he went to a place called Quack, which he re-named York, where he built a house and fortified it in reasonable good fashion.[2]

And how was it that Samoset, Lord of Pemaquid,[3] who surprised the Plymouth pilgrims with his "Welcome," was so master of the language as to be the interpreter of the colonists, unless he had familiar intercourse with Englishmen at his home?

[1] The case is well presented in a paper of R. K. Sewall, Esq. Popham Mem. Vol., p. 140.

[2] Levett's Voyage, Me. H. S. Coll. II, 88. This York has no connection with our present town of that name; it was probably on Casco Bay.

[3] Wrongly called a Wampenoag in some modern histories.

I refer once more to the supply of food for the suffering Pilgrims in 1622, which Winslow found at Monhegan, by which voyage, he says, "we not only got a present supply, but also learned the way to those parts for our future benefit."[1]

Prince (p. 236) quoting Bradford as authority, says of the year 1626, "This spring a French ship is cast away at Sagadahock; whereby many Biscay rugs and other commodities fall into the hands of the people at Monhiggen and other fishmen at Damarin's cove."

It is well known that Vines, the agent of Gorges, spent the winter of 1617 at the mouth of the Saco. In 1623 he was "living there" with his companions. In the patent to Oldham and Vines, 1629, it is recited that Oldham had for the six years past lived in New England, and had at his own expense transported divers persons there for the advantage of the general plantation of that country. "Tradition has assigned to Vines the honor of holding Pemaquid, Monhegan and Sagadahoc from 1609, when he removed to Saco."[2] Sir Ferdinando Gorges says plainly that the settlement of Vines was *before the voyage of Hobson*, who came over in 1611. There were settlements, or trading posts, still farther inland. There is not much doubt that it was as early as 1626 that Thomas Purchas was established with his family at Pejypscot (now Brunswick.)

These are but the briefest hints, and not a thorough showing of the merits of the case. Observe, I am not claiming for these settlements municipal organization, nor intrinsic worth and dignity, but only their mere existence and its actual recognition by England.[3]

[1] Prince, 203. [2] Poor, Vindication of Gorges.

[3] Capt. John Smith, a man who certainly does not mince matters of speech, intimates no sporadic and short-lived attempt when he speaks of the Sagadahoc as that river "where was planted the Western Colony by that Honourable Patrone of vertue Sir Iohn Popham, Lord Chief Iustice of England." Description of N. England in 1614, p. 22. Another passage may be cited from Virginias Verger: a learned and curious Discourse on the rights and benefits of English occupation in America. It has no date, but was written before 1620. "Mawooshen and other parts were many years visited by our men, and An. 1607 a Plantation settled at Sagadahock by two ships sent by that wise and seuere Iustice Sir Iohn Popham and others: the successe whereof hath been such that from the North Plantation it hath been dignified with the Title of *New England*." Purchas' Pilgrims. Bk. 9, ch. 20, vol. IV, p. 1812.

Capt. John Smith, in 1614, had come, to hold possession if need were, at Monhegan. But he concluded rather to build seven boats here, in which his company made a great fishing voyage, while he with eight men ranged the adjacent coasts. "On this voyage," he says, "I tooke the description of the coast as well by map as writing, and called it New England; but malicious minds amongst Sailors and others, drowned that name with the echo of Nusconcus, Canaday, and Pemaquid; till at my humble sute our most gracious King Charles, then Prince of Wales, was pleased to confirme it by that title, and did change the barbarous names of their principall Harbours and habitations for such English, that posterity may say, King Charles was their Godfather."

This map was published in 1616, with the "writing" as well;[1] and it is curious to see these names written at important points, marked also by figures of English-built houses, as if there were some respectable beginnings to warrant it. Pemaquid is called "St John's town:" a village near where Brunswick now stands is "Cambridge:" Casco (Yarmouth and Cumberland) is called "The Base:" Saco is "Ipswich:" York is "Boston:" and strange to say, the name "Plimouth" marks the spot where six years afterwards the Pilgrims landed.

It has been claimed[2] that this map of Smith's is conclusive of the question. I do not, however, press the argument so far. There is danger of the fallacy of "proving too much," as English names are given also to various spots in Massachusetts Bay known not to have been then occupied by Englishmen. The map certainly implies that there were settlements of some kind at these points on our coast, and if other evidence shows that there were English people there, both lines of argument together make a strong case.

But however it may be with John Smith's testimony, there is no doubt of the existence of such occupation, settled or unsettled, as furnished England with her argument against the claims of France. I cite two cases to show on what ground the English based their title.

The Spanish Secretary of State, 1612, complaining to the English King that he has planted his subjects in a country given by the Pope to Spain, Sir Dudley Carleton replies in

[1] John Smith's Description of New England, London, 1616.
[2] Popham Memorial, p. 346.

behalf of his King, that "the possessions north of Florida belonged to England by the right of discovery and actual possession by the two English Colonies thither deducted, whereof the latter is yet there remaining."

Again, in 1624, M. Tillieres the French Ambassador, claimed the territory of New England as a portion of New France, (as he might very justly do) and agreed to yield every thing else down to the gulf of Mexico. French plans of empire looked northward, and rested their base on the great inland sea where for a hundred years they had held almost undivided empire. The position was truly one of imperial importance, and it was felt to be so both by the French and English King. James I. called on Gorges to answer the French Ambassador's demand. He tells us he made so full a reply that there was no more heard of the French claim. By the abstract of this reply it appears that he based no argument whatever on the Plymouth Colony, but rested the case wholly on the settlements about the Kennebec in 1607, and following years, under the Great Charter of 1606.[1]

It has been claimed by some that the attempt of Gosnold on the Massachusetts coast in 1602 should have equal consideration. I do not disparage the noble enterprise of that leader whose followers so unworthily forsook him. But that attempt was solitary and isolated, and utterly abandoned, and forms no part of the early argument. Moreover, this was prior to the date of the Royal charter, and hence of no legal effect in establishing title.

Nor does the settlement of Jamestown, Virginia, come within our consideration; because this lay below any of the territory covered by the French charter, and so outside the French claim. The country in dispute, the coveted land, was that which is our New England,—especially the shores of this gulf of Maine.

What even if no one of these hamlets preserved an absolute identity of place or persons, or continuity in time?[2] It nevertheless remains true that these early settlements, broken,

[1] But Mr. Haven, (Massachusetts and its early History, p. 138,) says it was Gilbert's proceedings at Newfoundland which substantiated the English title to the whole country!

[2] The scattered settlers appear to have been in the habit of deserting their homes when threatened by the French or Indians, and gathering in the forts at Pemaquid and elsewhere.

scattered, insignificant pictures as they appear in themselves, were yet so permanent in their *ensemble* and constituted such persistent occupancy, that they stood forth like a bold headland or outer bastion of defence, by which England maintained her position against the assaults of France.

Had there been no English settlement or occupancy north of the 40th parallel of latitude prior to 1610, when Poutrincourt obtained a new grant of Acadia, the whole country north of that line must have fallen into the hands of the French, and there is no reason to doubt that at the first clash of arms France would have swept the British from the continent.[1]

The French claim was founded: 1st, on the voyage of Verrazzano, 1524, who first discovered the Gulf of Maine, and named the adjacent country New France: 2d, on the discovery and occupation ef Canada by Cartier, 1535, and following years: 3d, the grant of Henry IV, 1603, to De Monts: 4th, the voyage and occupation of the country under De Monts and Champlain, and others who claimed under this charter. The English title was defended on the following grounds: 1st, the discovery of Cabot, 1497: 2d, the possession of Newfoundland by Gilbert, 1583: 3d, the voyages and landings by Gosnold, Pring, Waymouth, and others: 4th, the charter of 1606, and consequent occupation by Popham and Gorges.[2]

We may well doubt if either of these sovereigns in thus assuming to bestow this country, had any rights which were founded on the principles of justice or the laws of nations. As simply representatives of their subjects the sovereigns could not grant what the subjects had not first acquired. A nation can acquire territorial rights by pre-occupancy, by conquest, or by treaty and purchase.[3] By neither of these titles was any power in Europe authorized to grant away this continent. The right of discovery might indeed give rise to questions of priority among the Europeans themselves, and it might be applicable in the case of desert, or uninhabited

[1] Poor's Vindication of Gorges.

[2] The English expressly disclaimed rights of prescription without possession. They never denied the French title to Canada, but claimed to restrict it to what they had first discovered and actually occupied. The French never had any possession of the coast west of the Kennebec. (Willis' Speech at Popham.)

[3] The foundation and nature of man's right to property in the land is one of the most interesting questions in political philosophy, and needs to be more thoroughly discussed than I have yet seen it.

lands; but it constituted no right as against the right of nativity, or original possession of the soil. The right by conquest accrues only as the issue of a just cause; and as for the right by purchase, there was very little of that as the foundation of land titles in this country. Pretended purchases there have been, but after the act of occupancy, and even then on no clear and fair terms of exchange. The savage mind may have seemed content with the bargain; but satisfaction for satisfaction is not the same thing as value for value.

The real ground upon which Europeans hold America is in the maxim that "Might makes right." The justification is sought in the doctrine that those have the best right to things who can make the best use of them,—the argument also of gentlemen of the road.

But the foundation of land titles in the original States of this Union, and in the adjacent provinces, is in these early royal grants and charters; the principle of which is purely that of the feudal theory.[1] The doctrine that the sovereign is such by Divine right,—that is, holding his powers immediately from God, and not deriving them through the people,—regards the people and the land alike as his property. This is the language of court and form in England to-day. This theory and this alone is at the bottom of these grants. Priority of seizure was the issue between the rival sovereigns themselves.[2]

The great question between the English and French, as to the right of possession, turned on the occupancy of the country under charter. And as the French based their claim largely on the settlements under the charter of De Monts in 1603, so the English based theirs upon this settlement in 1607 under

[1] So we hold our lands, most of us, on the basis of a feudal title, and we cannot do otherwise. That sentiment, uttered I believe by Pericles, that "What is obtained by wrong it cannot become right to hold," though it would seem sound in morals, is not an admitted maxim, nor even a practicable rule in the affairs of nations."

[2] The Privy Council of England in 1666, in a question that arose under the grant to the Duke of York, decided that "By the law of nations if any people make discovery of any country of barbarians, the prince of that people who make the discovery, hath the right of soil and government of that place; and no people can plant there without the consent of the prince, or the persons to whom his right is conveyed." So much had the theory "Prescriptio sine possessione haud valeat" been modified from the time of the Tudors to that of the Stuarts.

the Great Charter of Virginia, 1606. But as the charter of De Monts had been revoked in 1607, and its rights conveyed by a new charter to Madame de Guercheville, a strong advantage in the French case was lost; for the English claimed with great force that the English settlement under the English charter now gave them absolute priority and indisputable right.

But the French did not so easily abandon their title. On the contrary, they pushed their settlements and arms and missions[1] to the very western verge of their claim. When the Sagadahoc colony broke up, 1608, it is said[2] the French began to settle in their limits. The struggle was long and bitter, for both parties were impelled by self-interest and pride, and sustained by an assumed consciousness of right.

France and England in the field! Flags that have wrought high history ere now. How shall it be for the new world? It must be admitted that the French had as good a claim here as the English, and that they defended it with more chivalrous methods, and especially that their dealings with the aborigines evinced a better civilization, a finer humanity, or at least a gentler christianity. The old Viking blood was still too unmixed in English veins, and a strange and earnest softness, and a terrible grace seemed to rule the spirits where Gaul and Roman and Frank and Northman—and who knows what strain of Goth or Hun, or even stranger name?—had mingled to make one blood. Shall it be France or England? England! —comes the firm response. Whether for better or for worse is not for us to answer,—nor to question. Providence has settled that.

But imagination may picture what this vast continent would have been to-day, had the grand constructive purpose, the noble human sympathies, the gallant and chivalrous spirit of

[1] Father Dreuillettes had a mission on the Kennebec, 1646–52, and Father Râles in 1722. I can find no confirmation of Father Vetromile's statement that Madame de Guercheville had chosen the Kennebec as the favored spot for the Jesuit Mission. Biencourt and Father Biard had indeed visited this river in the autumn of 1611, and appear to have gone up the Androscoggin. But the objective point of the intended Jesuit Mission was somewhere near the famed Norumbega—that is, at Kedeskit (Kenduskeag) on the Pentagoet (Penobscot). It was a thick fog which stopped them at Mt. Desert. They named their station St. Saviour, out of gratitude for deliverance from the breakers. See the account, Relations des Jesuites, Vol. I, chap. XXIII; also notes to Poor's Vindication of Gorges.

[2] Prince's Annals, p. 119. President and Council's Relation, 1622.

the great Coligny and Conde been permitted to pass into lasting deed. How different might the lines of history lie, had the pure faith and tolerant spirit of Protestant France been planted here! And even as it was,—under Champlain and Richelieu, and in Jesuit hands,—what a different fate would have befallen the native races, had their country become the possession of that people who made themselves masters of all Acadia even to the very heart of Maine; of the shores of the St. Lawrence and the region of the great lakes, and down that vast valley of the Mississippi,—broad as the ocean itself,—without a single act of treachery or violence, and scarcely making an enemy,—though punishing many,—in all that vast extent; and who in spite of all that Churchman or Puritan could do,—in spite of England—in spite of Holland—in spite of Spain—held for more than a hundred and fifty years, twenty times the amount of territory possessed by all the rest, until Wolfe on the heights of Abraham in a single hour changed the destinies of a world!

That fight could not have been fought had not our scattered settlements clung to their little strongholds along these rocky shores, and held the thought and purpose of Englishmen high as the cross that floated above their heads. Deny not then all merit to men whose work though incomplete was needful to later success; grant the good deeds of those,—adventurers or royalists or churchmen,—whose stout manhood and unconquerable hope held the ground for England, though unknowing the high deeds which Englishmen of another faith should work in the broader name of man!

I have allowed myself so much time on this point because these earliest facts of our history, and the importance in which this portion of the country was held, are at the present time either unknown or studiously ignored. Nor is this merely an old story, or collection of dead facts that have no part in the life that is to be. For let it be remembered that this early struggle had a deep foundation; and rested back on great physical facts, enduring as time, that may yet again in the world's history have mighty parts to play.

My second proposition is, that Maine was the offspring of no other colony: or, stated positively, that Maine was herself in some sense the beginning of New England, and came honestly by her motto *Dirigo*, which so few seem to understand;

and that the persistent promoters of these early settlements—I mean the Pophams, the Gilberts and the Gorges—deserve to be known as they were,—the fathers of New England colonization. Observe, now, I am not undertaking to say that our present institutions were founded by these men, or that their blood runs in the veins of those who now inherit their place and name. Nor do I intend to assume anything that may still remain to be proved upon the question whether it was creed or christianity that was most truly the core and germ of our peculiar New England character and institutions—whether the life and spirit which constitutes this character is the legitimate outgrowth—single and simple—of the conscientious, constrained and austere Puritan, or the law-abiding, liberty-loving, self-asserting Englishman; or upon the other question, whether the accident of the whole territory lying along the Gulf of Maine being called in a royal charter after the name of a body of water which is but an inlet in comparison, shall be taken as evidence that all the territory so named the Province of Massachusetts Bay, was thereby made an offspring, dependency or fief of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. But I shall claim for Maine an independent and co-original part in the settlement of New England, and maintain that whatever may be the religious and ethical base of our character, the physical and strategic base of our political history lies here on the shores of Maine.

This can be presented under two points of view: I. Maine as a pioneer. II. Maine as a frontier.

Something of what belongs under this first head has already of necessity been anticipated. The topic may on that account be all the more briefly presented here.

The thought of building up an empire, or at least a civilization in the new world, was a creation of noble brain. Beneath the far-seeing eye of genius a vision arose of great and worthy ends; of a broad theatre where man could expand to his largest ideals,—of fresh and varied resources which should be the instruments of his noblest satisfactions. This vast conception must needs be slow of realization. It was a work not to be done at a blow. No man could "force the situation." Like all enduring achievement, the work was to be wrought out by slow and painful degrees, through toil and trial and perplexity and failures—with courage and forti-

tude and patience—appealing to all high motives and great endeavor. In this grand aim and with this broad charity did these men, noble by name and nature, embark in this enterprise. They were not—as some have ignorantly and even ungratefully charged—stimulated by the paltry greed of gain, nor fettered by political or religious creed. They hazarded their entire fortunes with no hope of reward in kind. They were noblemen, and yet they cared for the lowly: they were royalists, and yet they held up those that stood for the rights of man as man; they were churchmen, and they gave the right hand of fellowship to Separatist and Puritan.

Among these pre-eminent in influence and in honor, is Sir Ferdinando Gorges. Amidst all the political discords and distractions at home, he never swerved from his great thought of building up a christian civilization on the shores of the Gulf of Maine. He kept up, in fact, as we have seen, a legal occupancy. Nor were these agents representatives of his title merely, but of his purpose and plan as well. The successful visit of Captain John Smith to Monhegan in 1614, and his favorable account of the adjacent region, kindled a new interest in England and revived the hopes of Gorges. He immediately took the lead in organizing another colony to be conducted by the resolute and dauntless Smith, who, as all believed would be able to give a substantial body to the dim but fair visions that had so long hovered in their sunset skies.

In March, 1615, the little fleet set sail. But it seemed as if this were the signal for all the furies to be let loose. A few days out, a terrible storm swept all the masts of his largest ship by the board, and he was forced to put back to Plymouth. On the 24th of June, in another ship of only sixty tons, he renewed his voyage. Overhauled by an English pirate of vastly superior force, his own bold attitude overcame at once the demands of the pirates and the cowardly entreaties of his officers to surrender, and he effected his escape. Soon he was fallen upon by two French pirates. But nothing daunted, when his officers refused to fight, Smith threatened to blow up the ship under their feet, and opening his four guns on the pirates, he beat them off and held on his way. He next encountered a squadron of French men of war—eight or nine sail. This was an odds too great for his four guns, and he tried his skill at diplomacy. When by this he managed to

effect a release, a mutiny arose among his own officers and men, who refused to proceed on their voyage. This brought him on board the French admiral once more, who immediately gave chase to a strange sail which now hove in sight. His own ship's company thus deprived of their commander, yielded to mutiny or despair, and made their way back to Plymouth. Smith was kept two months a prisoner on board the French fleet, and compelled to take part in fighting the Spaniards. At length on the coast near Rochelle, he took advantage of a midnight storm to escape in a small boat. The storm and current drove him out to sea; but the boat drifted on a small island, "where he was found in the morning by some fowlers nearly drowned, and half dead with cold and hunger."[1] It was a narrow escape; for the French ship had foundered in the night. He succeeded in getting back to England, where he spent almost a year in distributing his books and map of New England, and vainly endeavoring to induce others to form another colony. Had Smith succeeded in reaching this coast as the head of a colony, we cannot doubt what his experienced mind, his practical skill and indomitable resolution would have achieved. But as it was, the hopes of Gorges and his friends were well nigh frustrated. Nothing that could be called a colony had as yet gained a footing on these shores. A few scattered beginnings dotted the coast between the Piscataqua and the Penobscot.

We have now to notice that Gorges unselfishly lent his best aid to every enterprise that might promote that dearest thought of his heart, the settlement of New England by English christians. It deserves to be known that the Pilgrim colony at Plymouth, was an object of his special care.

Previous to March, 1617, Gorges had been foremost among those who advised and persuaded the Brownists at Leyden to come to these shores. At this time, he says,[2] it was his desire and study "that means might be used to draw into those enterprises some of those families that had retired themselves into Holland for scruple of conscience, giving them such freedom and liberty as might stand with their likings. This advice being hearkened unto, there were that undertook the putting it in practice, and accordingly brought it to effect

[1] Mr. Folsom's Discourse, Me. Hist. Coll. II, 238.

[2] Brief Narration, chapter 21.

(such as their weak fortunes were able to provide) and with great difficulty recovered the coast of New England."[1]

It was Gorges also who obtained for them their final charter—given June 1st, 1621, enlarged in 1630—on which all the legal titles of the "Old Colony" are based. He says, "when they found they had no authority which could warrant their abode in that place, they hastened away with their ship, with order to their Solicitor to deal with me, to be a means they might have a grant from the Council of New England's affairs to settle in the place; which was accordingly performed to their satisfaction and the good content of them all."[2]

Before the Puritans set foot upon the shores of Massachusetts Bay, the Pilgrims had been made welcome to establish themselves,—or rather their settlements and trading posts,—at two of the most advantageous positions in Maine: the first in 1626 at Pentagoet, (Castine)[3] from which they derived good revenue, and where the encroachments of the French gave Miles Standish occasion for his stout sword; the second in 1628, on the Kennebec,[4] where, on their petition, they had a large and most valuable grant comprising at least a million and a half acres,—where also the famous John Alden figured as chief, and where conflicting claims afterwards led to long

[1] They came, it seems, with Captain John Smith's chart of New England in their hands, whereon, as we have seen, was already marked the site and name, New Plymouth. He says they thought it cheaper to take his chart, than himself as pilot. He speaks a little severely of their not taking more advice from him. Advertisements for Unexperienced Planters. (London, 1631) pp. 31–38. [2] Brief Narration, p. 48.

[3] Bradford's History, Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. III, p. 332. Also Judge Godfrey's article, The Pilgrims at Penobscot, Me. Hist. Soc. Coll., Vol. VII.

[4] This grant conveyed "all that tract of land lying in and between and extending itself from the utmost limits of the Cobbosee Contee, which adjoineth the River Kennebec, towards the Western Ocean and a place called the Falls of Nequamkike, and the space of fifteen miles on each side of the said River Kennebec." It is not known to this day what place is meant by the falls of Nequamkike. But this grant holds a prominent place in the history of land-title litigation. The Pilgrims sold their interest in 1661, for £400 sterling, to four persons whose heirs held it for nearly a century, without efficiently organizing the settlement of the country. In 1753 the lands passed to a company, and were thenceforward known as the Kennebec Purchase. The company had to contend with powerful neighbors, east and west—the Pemaquid and the Pejepscot Proprietors—but it maintained its regular meetings until 1816. See the valuable History of the Kennebec Purchase, by Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Me. H. S. Coll. Vol. II.

strife and to bloodshed. The Pilgrims did not hesitate to acknowledge their obligations to Gorges, in terms which showed the warmth of friendship between the churchman and the separatists. Thus, in a letter to him from Governor Bradford and others, in 1628, they say, "Honorable Sir: As you have ever been, not only a favorer, but also a most special beginner and furtherer of the good of this country, to your great cost and no less honor, we whose names are under written, being some of every plantation in the land, deputed for the rest, do humbly crave your Worship's help and best assistance."[1]

Moreover, it was the influence of Gorges and his associates, strengthened by their actual operations in settling the country, which procured the charter of 1620—while the Pilgrims were on their passage, and nine years before the Massachusetts Puritans landed—which is known as the Great Charter of New England. The charter itself declares, "We have been humbly petitioned unto, by our trusty and well beloved servant, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Knight, Captain of our Fort and Island by Plymouth, and by certain the principal Knights and Gentlemen Adventurers of the Second Colonye, divers of which have been at great and extraordinary charge, and sustained many losses in seeking and discovering a Place fitt and convenient to lay the Foundation of a hopeful plantation, and have years past, by God's assistance, and their own Endeavors, taken actual Possession of the Continent hereafter mentioned in our name and to our use as Sovereign Lord thereof, and have settled already some of our people in places agreeable to their Desires in those places."

This charter of 1620 granted the territory, from the fortieth to the forty-eighth degree of north latitude,—that is, from the latitude of Philadelphia to the Bay of Chaleur,—and through the mainland from ocean to ocean, to be known by the name of New England in America. The corporation was called the "Council of Plymouth" in the County of Devon, and the chief managers were Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Captain John Mason, and the Earl of Warwick. The breadth as well as the centre of their intended operations may be seen in the project early started of laying out a county forty miles square for general account, on the Kennebec river, and building a great city for a metropolis of New England on Merrymeeting

[1] Bradford's Letter Book, p. 63.

Bay, at the junction of the Kennebec and Androscoggin. These grand schemes were thwarted by the complications which arose at home and abroad, if indeed they would have been practicable in themselves. I only mention them for the purpose of showing that there were plans and purposes for New England, and even for Maine as its centre, before Massachusetts was settled at all.

I have already spoken of the patent granted the Pilgrims, June 1st, 1621, which was the very first grant of the Council of New England, and of the large grant of the Kennebec lands to the Pilgrims also, in 1628 and 1629. August 10, 1622, a patent was given to Gorges and Mason, conveying to them the country between the Merrimac and Kennebec to the farthest head of said rivers, and sixty miles inland, together with all the islands and islets within five leagues of the shore, which the indenture states "they intend to call the PROVINCE OF MAINE."[1]

But is was Gorges, also, who, with the Earl of Warwick, was instrumental in procuring the patent for the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay. Their views of church service were not the same; but the view of a new world to be built up by Englishmen for the glory of God's name, left no room for petty, partisan thoughts in his large mind. This patent was given March 19, 1628, covered and confirmed also by a Royal charter, September 29, 1629, which gave more security and definiteness to the political rights conveyed.[2]

[1] This has been erroneously termed the Laconia grant by Dr. Belknap (Hist. of New Hampshire) and by historians generally, misled perhaps by the account of F. Gorges the younger in his "America Painted to the Life," (London, 1658) who says the Province is "landward," and takes its name from the great lakes lying therein, but goes on to describe it as having the Sagadahoc and Merrimac south of it and as included in the Province of Maine. Bancroft, even in his Centenary Edition, Vol. I, 275, is still wrong as to this matter. Abbott also follows, calling Maine and New Hampshire, Laconia. The true Laconia grant was in 1629 and embraces the river and lake of the Iroquis (Lake Champlain) and the lands bordering on these waters ten miles on the south and east, and still farther west and north towards Canada. This grant was never effectual. The agent of Gorges searched three years for Laconia and returned the report "non est inventa Provincia." Mr. Dean, Report of Council American Antiquarian Society, 1868. Hubbard Hist. New Eng., chap. XXXI. Haven, Grants under great Council of N. England, p. 156. Prof. Ridpath's map of English grants has the still different error of giving the name Laconia to the Lygonia grant between Kennebunk and Casco.

[2] The Council of New England have no authority to convey powers of government. (Opinion of the Chief Justices of England on Mason's New Hampshire grant.)

In this patent, Gorges says it was expressly conditioned, that the grant should contain nothing to the prejudice his son Robert's interest, who in 1622 had a patent under the great New England Charter, of a tract extending ten miles on Massachusetts Bay. But the Massachusetts agents shrewdly found a way to pretend that this grant was "void in law," and the colony were advised "to take possession of the chief part thereof." This was forthwith done, and the former grantees driven off.[1]

In 1629, Gorges and Mason divided their territory. Mason took the western portion between the Merrimac and the Piscataqua, which he named New Hampshire, he being at that time Governor of Portsmouth in Hampshire, England; and Gorges the rest, from the Piscataqua to the Sagadahoc,—the region where his heart had always been,—and which ten years afterwards received the name of Maine.

Thus it appears that not only were these New Hempshire and Massachusetts settlements subsequent to those in Maine, but that they were each and all of them, indebted to the patronage of Gorges—younger members of his family of colonies—more favored brothers, who afterwards took the birthright.

Still more than this; Gorges suffered in the estimation of the high church party for his friendship to the Pilgrims and Puritans. Amidst the multitude of other vexations set forth by the Council of Plymouth, as reasons which drove them to give up their charter, we are told "the country proving a receptacle for divers sorts of sects, the establishment in England complained of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and he was taxed as the author of it, which brought him into some discredit, whereupon he moved those lords to resign their grand patent to the king."[2]

The encroaching disposition of the vigorous Massachusetts men had already added the sting of ingratitude to the afflictions which embittered Gorges' contemplations of his toils,

[1] When the Council of New England resigned their charter, 1635, they say that the Massachusetts Company "presenting the names of honest and religious men, easily obtained their first desires; but those being once gotten, they used other means to advance themselves a step beyond their first proportions to a second grant surreptitiously gotten, of other lands also, justly passed unto Capt. Robert Gorges long before."

[2] F. Gorges, (grandson of Sir Ferdinando) "America Painted to the Life."

and we cannot wonder—little as we may have wished his success—that he advised the king to revoke the Massachusetts charter.

We often have our attention called to what are thought to be the retributions of history, but the unrepaired injustices of history appear no less striking. After all the unselfish kindnesses and efficient aid the early Massachusetts settlers had received from Gorges, it does not suit our notion of the "fitness of things" that they should not only have succeeded in obtaining possession of his entire territory, but also in consigning his name to obscurity, obloquy or ridicule. However, we may appease our sense of justice by the charity of his own words: "But if there be any otherwise affected, as better delighted to reap what they have not sown, or to possess the fruit another hath labored for, let such be assured, so great injustice will never want a woful attendance to follow close at the heels, if not stayed behind to bring after a more terrible revenge. But my trust is, such impiety will not be suddenly harbored where the whole work is, I hope, still continued for the enlargement of the Christian faith, the supportation of justice, and love of peace. In assurance whereof, I will conclude, and tell you, as I have lived long, so I have done what I could. Let those that come after me do for their parts what they may, and I doubt not but the God that governs all, will reward their labors that continue in his service."

In thus claiming the independent and earlier settlement of Maine, it may be expected that I should be exact and definite. Precisely at what time and place the first permanent settlement of Maine was made is a difficult matter to determine. This is so for the very reason that the planting of Maine was by settlement rather than by colonies—"scattered beginnings," shifting homes and shifting occupants, which literally "settled" into shape and name. It has been quite the fashion to say that Maine was first settled near York in 1630 by colonists or immigrants from Massachusetts. Bancroft, no over-willing witness, admits[1] settlements gathering strength about Saco, Monhegan and Pemaquid, between 1616 and 1626. If Governor Sullivan is correct in his statement,[2] that there

[1] Vol. I, page 259, marginal notes.

[2] History of Maine, pp. 167 and 191. He gives the authority of Silvanus Davis, Councillor, 1702, from the council files, and so probably official and authentic.

were in 1630 eighty-four families, besides fishermen, about Merrymeeting Bay, Sheepscot, Pemaquid and St. Georges, and as many more "within land," there must have been at least 1,500 white people between the Piscataqua and the Penobscot at that time. Williamson[1] gives a table, I know not on what authority, evidently no mere estimate, (although even if it were, it would prove some considerable settlements) in which the population at that time of the several plantations is as follows: Isles of Shoals and other places, 200; Piscataqua settlement, 200; Agamenticus (York) 150; Saco, including Black Point, 175; Casco and Pejepscot, 75; Kennebec Patent (Pilgrim grant) 100; Sagadahoc, Sheepscott, Pemaquid, St. Georges and Islands, 500.

If these statements are correct, the implication is almost beyond the possibility of doubt (especially considering that these were slow settlements and not colonies) that these people must have been at least ten or fifteen years in arriving at that degree of establishment.

I have already shown the probability that there was a practically continuous settlement about Pemaquid and Monhegan, ever since the Popham colony dispersed. This appears to be well corroborated by the testimony now adduced, and my answer to the main question would be that the permanent settlement of Maine *begun* in 1607 and 1608, and in the region of the Sagadahoc.[2]

With this I rest my first point, that these early plantations were pioneers in the settlement of New England, and that Maine was not settled by colonization, nor the offspring of any other colony.

But 'Maine is the daughter of Massachusetts,' is the early lesson instilled into our minds; and hence it remains for us to understand this paradox—to find the manner and measure and reason of that dependence on Massachusetts which made

[1] Hist. Vol. I, p. 267. Possibly he means 1635, the year when Gorges organized a government at Saco.

Additional evidence may be given. A deed of land on the Pemaquid was executed to John Brown by two Sagamores, July 15, 1625.

The deed of Warumbo and five other Sagamores, July 7, 1684, says: "Thomas Purchase came into their country nearly sixty years before and took possession of lands from the falls to Maquoit." This shows the "settlement" of Brunswick as early as 1625.

[2] Observe that the eastern or Sheepscot mouth is also included, which was often in the earlier times spoken of as the Sagadahoc.

it possible for such an aphorism to obtain currency. Certainly it is far from being a self-evident proposition.

The old and simple reason is enough, namely, that Massachusetts was the stronger party, and that is the exact story here :—not necessarily, it will be readily seen, that she used that superior strength with malice, or ungenerously, but still that she used it, right or wrong, sagaciously and successfully. This introduces our second point, which was to present Maine as a frontier. This implies, of course, relation to a superior neighbor.

The idea of a frontier is one of much importance, and is illustrated in the relation of Acadia[1] (Nova Scotia) to New England. Gorges, who was thoroughly English and thoroughly Protestant, saw with the quickness, foresight and comprehension of a born commander, the designs of Catholic France upon our northeastern territory, and resolved on measures to push them from the New England borders. He interested himself in placing the Scotch in Acadia, and to this end procured a grant[2] from the Council of Plymouth for Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, which was confirmed by a Royal charter from James. I. in 1621, naming the country Nova Scotia, and conveying ample and extraordinary jurisdiction. Gorges hoped he had thus opposed an effectual barrier against the French by placing New Scotland on the flank of New England. But his bold tactics were not vigorously carried out by the Scotchmen. They had not even abililty enough to prevent the king, a few years after, from resigning to the French (as a *bonus* in a marriage intrigue) "all places occupied by British subjects in New France, Acadia and Canada."

[1] The importance of this territory as a vantage ground may be seen in the frequency with which it changed hands:

1632, ceded to the French, treaty of St. Germains;

1655, repossessed by the English by conquest;

1667, ceded to French by treaty of Breda;

1690, conquered by English under Phipps;

1691, united to Province of Massachusetts Bay, charter of William and Mary;

1696, repossessed virtually by French;

1696, surrendered back to Crown of England;

1697, reverts to France by treaty of Ryswick;

1713, ceded to England by treaty of Utrecht;

1755, expulsion of Acadians, who maintained allegiance to France;

1759, confirmed to England by capitulation of Louisburg and Quebec.

[2] Gorges' Brief Narration, 48.

This involved consequences which soon led all New England to see the wise policy of Gorges, and which for more than a century affected the life of Maine in every pulse, to her very heart.

The Great Council for New England did not find it easy to carry out their grand schemes of building up cities and counties and States without first developing the natural resources of the country. Work must not only be energetic but patient. True civilization must rest upon natural industries, and they develop but slowly. The Council were impatient for results. In their laudable eagerness to invite settlements, they became lavish and reckless in their grants,—overlaying patents, ignoring previous boundaries and titles even when granted by themselves, outraging geography and mathematics, and sowing the seeds of complications and controversies which vexed the domestic history of this province for over two centuries. Some of these grants have already been spoken of; but it may be worth while to notice such others as were within the limits of Maine, in order to understand the good occasion which Massachusetts had to sieze upon this province and hold and defend it as her own frontier of defence.

This is a dull chapter; but I shall receive something more than the forgiveness of those who having occasion to use these facts, find themselves spared the labyrinthine toil of explicating, ascertaining and arranging them. Besides those already mentioned, the Council issued the following patents in Maine:

1630. A deed to Thomas Lewis and Richard Bonythan of a tract on the north side of the Saco river, four miles along the coast and eight miles into the mainland. Also a deed of the same description to John Oldham and Richard Vines, on the south side of that river. The whole tract eight miles square. The foundations of the towns of Saco and Biddeford.[1] Vines and Bonythan appear to have had already a well ordered settlement. The memorandum of a deed May 17, 1629, calls Vines governor, and Bonythan assistant of the Plantation of Saco.[2]

1630. The Muscongus grant, afterwards known as the Waldo patent. This was issued to Beauchamp and Leverett of England, and extended on the seaboard between the Mus-

[1] Folsom's Hist. of Saco and Biddeford.

[2] Belknap's N. Hampshire, I. p. 291.

congus and Penobscot rivers, and as far north as would embrace a territory equal to thirty miles square.[1]

1630. Lygonia, or the Plough Patent, extending from Kennebunk to Harpswell, and forty miles inland, and including rights of soil and government.[2] This enterprise was for actual agricultural operations. The vessel which brought the colonists was named "The Plough." The attempt was ridiculed by the short-sighted adventurers around them. In fact, the colony was "laughed away," like "Spain's chivalry." In 1643 this patent was transferred to Colonel Rigby, a rich English lawyer and member of the long Parliament. The contest for jurisdiction between his and Gorges' heirs lasted forty years.

1631. Black Point patent—Scarborough—to Thomas Cammock. Fifteen hundred acres on the sea coast, on the east side of Black Point river. This is the basis of land titles in Scarborough to this day.[3]

1631. Pejypscot patent,—"fifteen hundred acres on the north side of the river, not formerly granted to any other." This to Richard Bradshaw.[4]

1631. Agamenticus (York),—twelve thousand acres to Edward Godfrey and others.[5]

1631. Richmond's Island, to Walter Bagnall,—the island and fifteen hundred acres on the mainland at Spurwink.[6]

1631. Cape Porpoise,—two thousand acres on the south side thereof to John Stratton.[7]

1632. Trelawney and Goodyear Patent,—the tract between Cammock's patent (Scarboro') and the river and bay of Casco, and as far into the mainland as Cammock's limits extend. It was claimed that this included part of Richmond's island, Cape Elizabeth, the ancient town of Falmouth (Portland) and a part of Gorham. There was a contest of boundaries for many years.

[1] Williamson, I. 260, says the north line settled upon is the south line of Hampden, Newburg and Dixmont. See also Me. Hist. Coll. VI, art. 15.

[2] Sullivan, Hist. 309. Land Titles 44. Williamson I. 238. Haven, Grants of N. E. Council, 158, and especially Willis' History of Portland, and Folsom's Hist. of Saco and Biddeford.

[3] Willis' Hist. Portland. Southgate's Hist. Scarboro'.

[4] This and the former mentioned grants were in consideration that the grantees had been living on the premises for some years. See Haven, 158.

[5] Sainsbury, Colonial Calendar. Willis' Hist. Portland.

[6] Sainsbury. Willis. Haven. Bourne; History Kennebunk.

[7] Willis' Hist. Portland.

1632. Pemaquid Patent. One hundred acres for every person brought in within seven years, and 12,000 acres along the sea coast and up the river, and all the islands three leagues into the ocean. Powers of government are also granted in the patent. "Pemaquid has been a subject of much controversy, and has experienced many vicissitudes."[1]

1632. Way and Purchas Patent, a tract on the river "Bishoppscotte" (Pejepscot), the Androscoggin, and "all that bounds and limits the mainland adjoining the river to the extent of two miles," reaching, it is supposed, to Casco Bay on the south. Purchas has been already referred to, as the earliest settler in this region. This grant was the subject of long and bitter controversy with the Pejepscot Proprietors, not settled till 1814.[2]

The Great Council of New England having encountered many vexations, agreed to surrender its charter[3] in 1635; and as if there were not already sufficient confusion of title, determined to divide its territory into eight provinces, two of which were within the present limits of Maine. The region between the St. Croix and the Kennebec,—already claimed by the French,—was to be given to Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, perhaps as some compensation for the loss of Nova Scotia, ceded to the French,—and was to be called the county of Canada. This extended to the St. Lawrence. The coast from the Kennebec to the Piscataqua, including the north half of the Isles of Shoals,[4] and extending sixty miles into the main land, was assigned to Gorges—the same previously granted him by patent to Gorges and Mason—and by him now named New Somersetshire, after the county in which his English estates lay.

With his vigorous and law-loving mind he at once proceeded to establish a government, under his nephew, William Gorges, who set up a court at Saco in 1636. This was the

[1] Haven, 159. See Sewall's "Ancient Dominions;" Thornton's Ancient Pemaquid; Dr. Hough's article, Me. Hist. Soc. Vol. VII; Professor Johnston's History of Bristol; also "Pemaquid Papers" relating to the Duke of York's possession, Albany, 1856; and the Hist. Coll. Vol. V.

[2] Willis' Hist. Portland. Me. Hist. Coll. Vol. III, Articles V and VI. See for all the foregoing, Williamson; and Haven's Lecture, Lowell Inst., before cited.

[3] The Massachusetts charter was also to be annulled, and the whole coast to the Hudson river divided among the proprietors named. See Gorges' Brief Narration. Hubbard's Hist. of New England.

[4] The south half of the Isles of Shoals went to Capt. Mason.

first organized government within the limits of Maine. From the number and the nature of the cases here tried, there is every reason to believe that this administration of justice and morality was much needed.[1]

Gorges had many things to look after both at home and abroad. He had now been appointed governor-general of all New England, as a part of the king's purpose to take away the Massachusetts charter and to resume to himself the jurisdiction within the entire New England limits. But Gorges was too much of a general to fail to perceive that he could not be governor. He well understood that it would not do to take away the Massachusetts charter. Young as that colony was, he plainly saw that their vigor and aggressiveness were indispensable to a successful resistance to the encroachments of the French. Whatever his private griefs, he was for Englishmen as against Frenchmen, and for Protestants against Romanists. Political troubles in England more and more pressed upon his attention, so that his affairs in America suffered neglect. Still, he offered generous inducements to draw colonists hither. He encouraged gentlemen of rank and influence to share his enterprise. Among his private grants was one to Sir Richard Edgecombe, of 8,000 acres near the lake of New Somerset (Merrymeeting Bay), in the present town of Bowdoinham.[2] But he could not fail to see that something was lacking, and that the colonies to the west were more prosperous than his own; and reflecting upon the situation and discovering some of the causes of it, he laments his own errors and impolicy in manly words, which admirably express a deep truth of economic science: "Trade, fishery and lumber have been the phantoms of pursuit, while there has been a criminal neglect of husbandry, the guide to good habits, the true source of wealth, the almoner of human life."[3]

But growing political jealousies unsettled everything in Old England and New. Emigration was discouraged. Disorder and lawlessness ran riot in the new plantations, where there was no hand to keep them down. The administration of justice was no easy task in the county of New Somersetshire. Nor was there any general government. When we recollect that not less than ten of the grants and patents before enumerated fell within the limits of this county, and that many of

[1] Records of York County, Me. Hist. Col. Vol. I.
[2] Williamson I, 268.
[3] Quoted from Williamson I, 260.

them were in controversy with each other, and all naturally indisposed to acknowledge Gorges' jurisdiction, we cannot be surprised that this territory was anything but a harmonious society, and that the government which represented his authority was practically limited and local.

Amidst the distractions of the times, to assure himself of his title between restless Frenchman and encroaching Puritan —Gorges in 1639 succeeded in obtaining from King Charles I. a new and notable charter,—the most extraordinary ever given to a subject in modern times. It confirmed all the territory within his old boundaries, the Piscataqua and Sagadahoc, extending however 120 miles inland, and was now for the first time, and by charter, named the PROVINCE OF MAINE.[1]

The political status of this Province was that of a Palatinate, of which Gorges was Lord Palatine. This title originated under the Merovingian Kings, and designated a high judicial officer, resident in the palace, who had supreme authority in all causes coming under the cognizance of the Sovereign. After Charlemagne the title was applied to any powerful feudal lord to whom a frontier province was made over with *jura regalia*, or royal judicial powers. These are all recited at large in the curious charter of the Palatinate of Maine.[2]

This is the only instance of a purely feudal possession on this continent. There is nothing like it, except, in a remote degree Sir William Alexander's tenure of Nova Scotia, and Lord Baltimore's of Maryland.[3]

[1] All the old historians say that this was so named in honor of Henrietta Maria, who had as dower the Province of Maine in France. Mr. Folsom (Address at Brunswick in 1832) was the first, I believe, to question this statement, in which he is followed by Bryant in his new and thoroughly reliable History of the United States, 1876. It appears that the Province of Maine was not a possession of the French princess, but belonged to the crown. (See also Agnes Strickland's Lives of the Queens of England.) There is little doubt that the name arose in the natural distinction made in common speech between the islands then so much frequented, and the shoreland or the "main." The spelling furnishes no argument. The adjective was often spelled "maine," and the proper noun "Main."

[2] They may be found in the appendix to Sullivan's History of Maine.

[3] Sir William had the right of conferring titles of nobility. He even added dignity to the Frenchman La Tour,—"Sir Claude de Estienne, Knight, lord de la Tour et de la War, Baronet of New Scotland."

Lord Baltimore's administration is equally remarkable for its liberal and liberty-loving spirit, and furnishes the first, and for sometime the only declared instance of religious toleration in this country. It deserves special mention, that the Roman Catholics should have set the Protestants of America an example of christian equality and fellowship.

The venerable knight proceeded to organize his jurisdiction with an amplitude which now serves to excite the smiles of democratic young America, or furnishes exclamation points for dull chroniclers who know things only by their names. But to those who know his large thoughts and orderly mind, and recall his late confessions of the lack of a sound basis for his colonial enterprises hitherto, his ordinances and commissions seem as admirable an organization as could be devised under the feudal theory, and as well fitted for its purpose in securing social and civil prosperity as were the constitutions for which we praise Alfred and Charlemagne. He placed the Government in the hands of a kinsman of his, and made every effort to establish justice, to quiet disputes and to reconcile the inhabitants throughout his perturbed province. He established a general court at Saco in 1640, and the next year organized a capital at Agamenticus, now York, which he named Georgiana,—the first chartered city in America known to history. All the details proper and proportionate for such a capital were specified with the carefulness of one who knows his business and means it. Some affect to ridicule his proceedings because his city had then but three hundred inhabitants. But three hundred men in orderly array have many a time made better work in the world's history than as many thousands could have done as mere mobs or masses.[1] Sheer numbers never make a city nor a nation. It is organization—not of brute force and mere numerical units, but of broad ideas, and high purposes for great moral ends, which is the soul of States, as of cities. Could Gorges have dwelt in the midst of his plantations, in the "house and home" which he thanked God he had there, his city doubtless would have served its ends and justified his foresight, and his province grown strong in the diversified industries and harmonious interests of its people. His followers had not entered into his ideas, and missed his inspiring presence and guiding hand.

But Gorges was a royalist and a man loyal to his convictions, and the desperate state of political affairs at home withdrew his attention from his more private interests, however broad and noble. Though now advanced in years, he buckled on his sword in the king's cause, and his firm body and intense spirit found congenial service in the cavalry of the dashing

[1] Plymouth Colony had only two hundred and fifty people ten years after its settlement.

Rupert. But the troubles grew deeper and darker, and both Gorges and his royal master went into the shadow and never came out again.[1]

The power that could give unity and order to the province passed away. Gorges' little empire fell apart in mimicry of that of his great predecessor, Charlemagne. The natural results of so many careless grants and overlapping claims burst forth with vigorous demonstration. The maxim that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, was proved equally true of jurisdictions. All authority was contested, and the spirits of anarchy and lawlessness held high carnival. The only thing that began to assume definite shape was the rivalry between the Gorges and the Rigby interests, which took on a religious and political character and had its reasons in the great questions then agitating every English mind. Massachusetts looked on with anxious and impatient interest, but as yet she held aloof. She had even shut out Maine from the New England Confederacy of 1643, because as Winthrop says,[2] "the people ran a different course from us both in the ministry and civil administrations." All that now called itself Maine was shrunk into the southwest corner of the province, where the people entered into a voluntary organization, not as an independent political society, but as preservers of the peace in the name and sovereignty of England. Edmund Godfrey had thus been made governor in that section, and had been recognized both at home and abroad as entitled to at least "belligerent rights." Appeal was made to England for a new grant of political powers, that this little republican order of society might be legally established.[3] Meantime, affairs in Lygonia were no better. A provincial government had been set up, but there were too many independent grants within its territory to make a perfect picture of domestic harmony. Now was the opportunity for Massachusetts—the moment for her to profit by a cool head and a bold blow. Many individuals, from the Kennebec to the Piscataqua, outwearied with the undecided strife, had already

[1] Gorges died 1647. Charles was beheaded 1649.

[2] Winthrop's Journal, p. 275. Rhode Island and Providence plantations were also for like reasons excluded. Bancroft, I. 342.

[3] "It is our humble prayer," say the Provincial Court, in their petition to the House of Commons, 1651, "that the privileges and immunities of free born Englishmen may be granted and secured to ourselves and our posterity."

accepted her "protection." Some of the chief disputants now appealed to her as a powerful neighbor well managing her own interests, to adjust their contested jurisdiction. She did it,—much as the fable describes the sagacious monkey as settling the cheese question for the cats. The latter, at the end, found themselves treated both alike—with strict impartiality, but no cheese!

It cannot be pretended that the desire to see peace among her neighbors was the great motive that prompted her action. There were more natural, more urgent reasons. This vast territory, the many and turbulent colonies—Episcopalian whether royalist or republican—already giving token of their excessive freedom of conscience and lack of admiration for certain puritanical ideas, made a dangerous neighbor. The French, too, were pressing their borders nearer and nearer. Who could tell but these high church Englishmen might, as was no uncommon thing in those days, prefer an alliance with the French Catholics rather than with their Puritan brother?[1]

It was necessary—that supreme appeal of patriot or tyrant when a bold blow must be struck in self-defence—that reason, the limit and moral of which it is so impossible to ascertain—it was necessary that Massachusetts should control Maine. She had the need, surely; she had the power, also: and in such tumultuous times, that easily makes right. Perhaps, like some in this age as in every other, she refused to embarrass herself by reflecting that those who have power are by so much the more bound to do the right. At all events, she took the step, and afterward deliberated on it. "Possession is nine points of the law," and it is easy then to make out the balance. The case was a curious one, and worth recalling.

The terms of the Massachusetts charter (which Gorges had first assisted them to procure) established their northern boundary three miles north of the Merrimac and each and every part of it,—which of course only meant *three miles beyond the river*. To this line all had agreed. But when it was found necessary to justify the seizure of Maine, the Massachusetts men suddenly conceived a new interpretation.

[1] "The inhabitants of New Hampshire, Maine, and the Duke's Province, were holding a friendly correspondence with their French neighbors, while Massachusetts was entertaining a hatred towards them." Randolph's Report, 1676.

The river, it was found, makes a right angle about thirty miles from the sea, and from that point stretches to the north; so instead of a line three miles across the river at its mouth, they took a point three miles north of its head waters and from that run a line easterly to the sea! This *coup d' etat* gave them the whole of New Hampshire and nearly the whole of Maine.[1]

The New Hampshire towns, settled now chiefly by Puritans from Massachusetts, and naturally averse to the jurisdiction of churchmen like Mason and Gorges, seem to have acquiesced. Lygonia generally offered little resistance. Far otherwise Maine. Godfrey of York refused to submit. He declared the boundaries had been fixed more than twenty years before, and a lawful jurisdiction ever since exercised, acknowledged both by Massachusetts and the English Government. "We will maintain our rights," says the Governor, "until it shall please the Parliament, the Commonwealth of England otherwise to order, under whose power and protection we are."[2]

But all in vain. A majority was against him, and Godfrey himself finally submitted with the rest. The name and charter of Georgiana were abandoned, to kill out every spark of the Gorges spirit, and the town was named York. And so, little by little, town by town, by small majorities, a general submission was made, and for a few years there was "peace."[3]

Massachusetts was never mean. She was square and bold. You could always see her coming, and tell what she was after. But she was wise in her policy here. She never made church membership a condition of the right of suffrage, as she did in her own colony. She carried a court along with her to preserve the forms of justice, and that is a good deal. In 1652 she was at York and Saco. In 1656 she was at Falmouth. The next year an action was brought against Thomas Purchas of Pejepscot; but he boldly pleading to the court's jurisdiction the jury returned a verdict in his favor, which was carried by appeal to the General Court at Boston and sustained in the decision that "Pejepscot was not within the Massachusetts

[1] This line struck the sea at Clapboard island in Casco Bay.

[2] Sullivan, 322. See also in Williamson, Vol. I, 337, the spirited correspondence of Godfrey and the Massachusetts government.

[3] Sullivan says, (p. 355) "The men who submitted were those who had taken up land by possession"—that is to say, "squatters"—"and wished an assurance from some power which would not expect a very valuable consideration."

jurisdiction;" whereupon they not long after had a new line run more suitable to the exigency, and carried it this time east of the Sagadahoc—to White Head Island in Penobscot Bay.[1]

For this they had in their view good reason. There were Englishmen at Pemaquid and in that neighborhood, who must be controlled. The new boundary accordingly was made to include these settlements. Nor was the reason less but rather more from the fact that this territory east of the Sagadahoc belonged to the Duke of York. The Duke had purchased from the Earl of Stirling in 1663 all his American possessions, and the next year received a Royal charter from his brother, Charles II, of all the territory from New Scotland westward to the Pemaquid and the Kennebec, and northward to the St. Lawrence.[2] He had, however, easily consented that the French should have all his patent east of the Penobscot, which was confirmed to them by the treaty of Breda. He was not a man to be trusted as a neighbor, especially as a frontier between Puritans and Frenchmen. So it was necessary to contest his possession, if not his title, by practical occupation and civil jurisdiction.[3] So Massachusetts set up a court and organized a local government at Pemaquid in 1674, naming the territory from Sagadahoc to Georges river, the County of Devonshire. But the Duke's government at New York in 1683, also erected "Pemy-Quid and all the Territories in these parts with the Islands adjacent," into the County of Cornwall,[4] with the right to send one member to the General Assembly at New York.[5] This connection continued until the succession of the Duke of York to the throne as James II, when by a Royal order these territories were annexed to the New England government.[6] It will not be difficult to see that this taking possession of Sagadahoc outside the Gorges and the Lygonia claim, and of Pemaquid which was under the jurisdiction of the Duke of York, was no act in the interests of domestic peace or common justice,[7]

[1] Williamson I. 442. Sullivan, 372.

[2] See the charter, Albany "Pemaquid Papers," p. 5.

[3] A court had been set up in the name of the Duke, in 1665.

[4] The Duke's agents also called it *New Castle*.

[5] Gyles Goddard represented Cornwall County in the New York Assembly during one session.

[6] In 1686. Dr. Hough's introduction, Pemaquid Papers, p. 4.

[7] I do not forget a petition of certain inhabitants of Pemaquid and vicinity, in 1672, for the intervention of Massachusetts; but her whole motive and reason does not necessarily lie in that.

but an act of "military necessity," with a look to remote ends, an "offensive-defensive" to keep the great struggle away from her own border.[1]

It may well be believed that the state of things throughout the whole territory was as unfavorable as possible to the prosperity of its people. The permanent settlement of Maine, socially and politically, was quite as long delayed as its territorial settlement had been before. The strangest thing was that people everywhere were petitioning somebody else to come and rule over them,—one evil result of so many careless grants to parties naturally antagonistic. One petition from seventy-one inhabitants of Maine and Lygonia was addressed to Oliver Cromwell in 1656, praying that they might be under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. Another, some twenty years after, from one hundred and seventeen inhabitants of Maine to Charles II, protesting against the invasion of their rights and privileges by the "Bostoners," and claiming his protection.[2] In 1663 Massachusetts had sent a mandatory address to the people of Maine requiring them to give obedience to her laws;[3] and in 1664 the king himself had written them a letter declaring the illegality and injustice of the Massachusetts acts, and peremtorily ordering all persons to restore to the representatives of Gorges the peaceable possession of the Province, or otherwise without delay show cause why they should not.[4] They do not seem to have done either. Accordingly commissioners were sent out by the Crown to investigate the matter. They appointed prominent citizens to act as magistrates until the king could decide the question. But Massachusetts also entered with a military force, where a court under this authority was in session at York, and (says an eye-witness) "with a troop of horse and foot turned the judge and his assistants off the bench, imprisoned the commander of the local militia, and threatened the judge and all who favored the Gorges interest."[5]

[1] The Massachusetts view of the case finds a spirited advocate in Mr. Thornton—"Ancient Pemaquid." The matter is treated in a more judicial temper by Professor Johnston,—"History of Bristol," and Dr. Hough,—"Pemaquid, and its Relations to our colonial History." Me. Hist. Coll. Vol. VII.

[2] See the petitions, Me. Hist. Coll. Vol. I. pp. 392, 400.

[3] Williamson, I, 404.

[4] Williamson, I. 412, 413.

[5] Josselyn's Two Voyages, p. 151. Williamson says he is biased, but an eye witness is likely to be. See also Bancroft I, 448.

But the question being before the High Court of Chancery, the King in Council in 1677, rendered the just and common sense decision, that the north line of the Massachusetts Colony was three miles from the north bank of the Merrimac at its mouth, and that the Province of Maine, both as to soil and government, was the rightful property of the Gorges' heirs.

Upon this decision, with what Judge Story calls "prudence and sagacity," Massachusetts instructed her agent to make purchase of the title; and the heir, for whatever reason, sold his inheritance for £1250—Province, Palatinate, Jura Regalia and all,—and possession was duly proclaimed under this title, and no word more of the three mile line north of the head waters of the Merrimac.

Strange to say, the first thought seems to have been to sell the province. It was evidently of far more value than the price paid for it, and the year after the transfer the governor and assistants were authorized to dispose of it.[1] But distrust of the purposes of the Royal cabinet and fear of the French prevailed, and in 1679 the order was revoked. But the embarrassments were not over. In resting her title on the assignment of the Gorges' interest, Massachusetts was bound by the charter stipulations and could not treat Maine as a constituent of her colony. The Puritan Province had in fact become the feudal Lord Palatine of the Maine Province, and was in duty bound to give it a separate organization. This was done, and Thomas Danforth, a high-minded and accomplished man, was appointed President of Maine.[2] Still, there was discontent. In many minds it remained a serious question whether political sovereignty was matter of purchase, and could pass with the soil,—whether under this transaction there were any other assignable rights than pecuniary.[3] But really there was not much now for any civil government to do; for the terrible wars had now begun, which,—French and

[1]Hutchinson (Hist. p. 296) says "to reimburse the expense of defending it," but this seems like the fallacy of the "circle." To a large number of inhabitants this defense was offense. To make a country pay the expense of subjugating it, is a measure of war, not of peace.

[2]This was in 1680. From this time no more deputies from Maine were sent to the General Court, as they had been since 1653.

[3]This question enters into the depths of political law. The policy of England to this day in forbidding aliens to hold real estate in fee, would seem to imply an admission that ownership of soil carries political as well as pecuniary rights.

Indian,—lasted with a few lulls almost a century, and nearly depopulated Maine.

I shall be obliged to correct the statement sometimes made, that Massachusetts defended Maine without expense to this province. It was indeed part of the terms on which eastern provinces submitted to her jurisdiction that they should bear no part of the public charges; but as matter of fact, Maine furnished both men and money to the last degree of her ability. We have official returns of the organized militia of "Yorkshire" for 1675, which numbered in that year seven hundred men; while that of Devonshire and parts adjoining was estimated at three hundred,—making a thousand men at that early period mustered for the public defence. We find, also, a due proportion of the expenses of the war assessed on the Province. Thus, for the year 1655 a list of taxes shows the assessment of five towns from the Isle of Shoals to Cape Porpoise, to be in the aggregate £91. 15s. The public taxes of Falmouth for 1683 were £17. 17s. 10d. A more striking evidence of the pecuniary part borne by Maine in the defence appears in the remonstrance addressed to the king against the encroachments of Massachusetts already referred to, which complains of the grievous burden of three thousand pounds laid upon the three towns of Kittery, York and Wells.[1]

There was no love between Charles II. and Massachusetts. Nothing could be more opposite than the stern purpose of that colony to achieve religious independence, and gather a political power which would enable them to do so, and the purposes,—if so strong a word can be applied,—of the dissolute and enervate king. The restoration had brought with it a flood of evils most odious to the Puritans, and in the natural reaction their enemies found easy occasion to gratify their hatred. But these persecutions had the effect of strengthening Massachusetts as the champion of the cause of liberty. Relying on the amplitude of her charter, and strong with the prescience of a Divine vocation, she did not hesitate to make

[1] The petitioners declare that in the year 1668 the "Bostoners entered the province, and with force of arms disturbed the inhabitants, then at a Court holden for your Majesty at Yorke in your Majesties province of Maine, commanding all proceedings for the future to be managed by their own authority and laws. Since which time notwithstanding the greate loss sustained by the late Indian war, we are still oppressed with heavy rates and taxes, imposing the sum of three thousand pounds and upward to be collected and paid by the inhabitants of three towns, (viz.) York, Wells and Kittery."

many laws more consonant with her own ideas than with the laws of England. Her charter indeed restrained her from passing laws and ordinances repugnant to the laws and statutes of the realm of England, but she construed this in the broadest sense as restraining her only from acts repugnant to the spirit of English laws. Certainly she did violate much o the letter of the common and statute law of England. Whether she did therein violate her charter was a question on which a serious issue could be taken. But it gave the opportunity her enemies desired. She was threatened once more with forfeiture of her charter,[1] and active measures were taken to carry this into effect. Alarmed at this, and hoping that she might propitiate Charles, who earnestly desired to confer this province upon his son, the Duke of Monmouth, she instructed her agents to give up Maine if she could thereby retain her charter. But all in vain: the case was foreclosed against her. A writ of *quo warranto*[2] was brought before the court of the king's bench (July, 1683), and this not proving sufficient it was followed by a *scire facias* sued out

[1] A quo warranto writ had been brought in 1635, but with no practical effect.

[2] A writ by which the government summons a defendant to show *by what warrant* he claims an office or franchise. The pleadings are peculiar, —the burden of proof being not upon the plaintiff but upon the defendant. The principle seems to be that the franchise is a trust, and the violation of any of the terms of a charter works a forfeiture. (2d Kent Com. 298, I. Sharswood's Blackstone, 485.)

Scire facias is also a mode of enforcing forfeiture when the defendants have abused their charter powers. An explanation of this change of writ and also the change from the king's bench to chancery, would require elaborate preparation; but a brief reference may assist those who desire to form a judgment in the matter, but have not materials at hand. Chief Justice Parker in his very able defence of "Charter and Religious Legislation of Massachusetts," says that "Chancery has no jurisdiction of proceedings quo warranto, and relieves against, rather than enforces forfeitures." The old writers, however, say that this writ, like all other civil writs, originally issued out of Chancery. (See Coke 2d, Inst. 277, 283.) But it would seem that the quo warranto process did not run into the colonies outside of England; and that is the reason why the writ of 1635 failed, no service of it being made within the colony. It appears that chancery has a wider jurisdiction, and may annul a charter beyond the limits of the realm. Moreover, if I understand the nature of scire facias, it permits the Crown for cause of forfeiture, to repeal its own grant by its own prerogative. (See, under the article, Bouviers' Law Dict., also Chief Justice Parker as above, and Palfrey's Hist. Vol. III, p. 391, 394). But at all events the change of writs shows that the enemies of Massachusetts were bound to take away her charter, and that without "the law's delay."

of chancery, (June, 1684.) Forfeiture was declared, judgment confirmed, and the Massachusetts charter fell;—that bulwark against Parliament and King—that pledge and protection they had borne so anxiously to these shores, and to which they looked to bear them triumphantly through all trials—their hope and glory for the future.

A copy of this judgment was served in Boston in the following July. But a decree of Providence suddenly changed the entire face of affairs. Charles I. died; James I. ascended the throne, a man of very different mould,—and then were renewed those commotions and oppressions which in this country were connected with the name of Sir Edmund Andros and the attempt to consolidate and virtually subjugate all the northern colonies; and which in England resulted in the revolution of 1688, the flight of James, and the accession of the House of Orange.

The Massachusetts charter was annulled; and although the commotions of the times stayed the full execution of the judgment of forfeiture, there is no doubt her authority was seriously weakened. Her government of Maine had at the best a very questionable title, and nothing but the judicious administration of Danforth and the large recognition of local self-government, prevented Maine from escaping from the hold of Massachusetts. These were troubled times for all the colonies. But at the accession of William and Mary all was joy in Massachusetts. She resumed her ancient rights, and immediately pressed for a restoration of her old charter. But there were many interests to be harmonized now: the sovereigns, though sympathizing with the Puritans, were unwilling to restore so democratic a charter, and one moreover which was so freely interpreted. There were strong shades of difference in religious and political opinions among the colonists, but the late disturbances and common sufferings had quickened the sentiment of a common cause and the need of unity. And so in 1691 these elements, harmonious or discordant, were bound together by a Royal charter which consolidated the colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Maine, Sagadahoc, and all Acadia,[1] under one title, the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Nearly all this territory bordered on the

[1] Old Acadia, east of the St. Croix, was five years afterwards ceded back to the Crown;—Massachusetts having without that, all the frontier she needed either to defend or be defended.

gulf of Maine; but this name was not then known, and the power and influence of the Massachusetts Colony received a significant recognition in this appellation. Maine was now at last part and parcel of Massachusetts; but she had the satisfaction of seeing one of her own born sons, Sir William Phipps, bearing the royal Commission as Governor.

The common saying, "Massachusetts the mother of Maine,"[1] is one of those figures of speech which gain currency because of the terseness of the phrase rather than from the closeness of the analogy. Such figures arise on some slight resemblance of relation, and then a train of natural associations assumes all the rest, so that the conclusion is altogether wide of fact. There is no sense in which Massachusetts is the mother of Maine. The metaphor would seem to imply either that Maine was a colony proceeding forth from Massachusetts, planted and established by her; or at any rate, that she nourished and supported the colony with that spirit of tenderness and self-sacrifice which makes the name of mother venerated and dear.

Neither of these functions seems to have been exercised. Historically, it is not true that Maine was in any sense or degree, in the early times at least, an offshoot, colony or representative of Massachusetts. The facts as we have seen them are, that she first assumed—if I may not say usurped—then purchased, then maintained by force of interest or arms, the powers which even at the last were not granted to her *over* Maine, but to her and Maine co-ordinately, or as merged in one. Massachusetts was indeed the guardian of Maine so far as this, that it became her duty, having assumed jurisdiction, to administer justice and defend from violence. Her influence and aid were powerful in Maine's behalf as against a common foe. But as between the two parties, her power was that of a master and not a parent. As guardian of Maine she strictly exercised her functions, and charged the expense to the estate of the ward.[2]

[1] History might warrant us in saying in good earnest, Massachusetts is the mother of Connecticut; and also of Rhode Island, though the child had rather a rough weaning.

[2] On the separation she kept half the public lands in Maine — over 4,000,000 acres. It must not be forgotten, however, that in 1870 she generously joined with Maine, releasing her proportion of the old joint war-claim against the United States, in aid of the European and North American Railway, as an enterprise of great public interest.

As the owner of Maine, she was not a parent; for the rights of a parent look to the good of the child, and are limited by that. She did not purchase Maine for the good of that territory, but for her own good; and the rights she acquired were not those of a parent, nor was the spirit of the relation that. She took possession of Maine in self-defence, to ward off her enemies, churchmen, Frenchmen, Indians; and the frontier suffered as much for her as she did for the frontier. Enemies were thus brought upon Maine who might not otherwise have struck at her. As standing in some respects *in loco parentis*, with rights acquired by transaction and not by birth, it was only by a legal fiction that she was mother,—that is, a mother-in-law, or step-mother. She had not even seniority; and we cannot much wonder that the older daughter of the family might be a little "unreconstructed" towards the assumptions of the new comer, whom the law, and the law alone, made mistress of the house and home.

I will briefly enumerate the main points made in support of the proposition before us,—namely, that Maine is not the daughter of Massachusetts, but had an independent origin and her own proper place in early history.

1. Maine was peopled, if not settled, before Massachusetts.

2. Political jurisdictions were in force here, and acknowledged by England and by Massachusetts, long before the latter entered into Maine.

3. The protectorate she exercised here was not mainly for the sake of the protected, but for her own necessity.

4. This protectorate was a usurpation,—at best a *de facto* government,—and did not confer or confirm to her political sovereignty.

5. Her purchase of the Gorges title, if valid in all respects, —that is, conveying sovereignty as well as soil,—at most only covered the territory between the Piscataqua and the Sagadahoc, and 120 miles back from the sea. Nor even within this, did it extinguish the Lygonia patent, from Kennebunk to Harpswell and 30 miles inland.

6. Her exercise of powers east of the Sagadahoc was without pretence of legal claim.

7. Her own charter was annulled by *scire facias* which was of full legal effect although never practically enforced. This at least extinguished her political rights in Maine.

8. The Charter of William and Mary did not restore

former rights and titles, and did not even confirm the equitable claims of Massachusetts to Maine.

9. This charter did not put Maine under Massachusetts as a province or dependency, but made it a constituent part of the new Royal Province, which was not the old Massachusetts Colony, but took its name because that was the strongest and most active organization at that time.

It is an agreeable transition to pass to the third proposition, —that New England, especially Massachusetts, preserved Maine to the American Union. It is so easy to misunderstand one's motives when we do not sympathize with his conclusions, that I must beg to say that in the facts and reasonings which have been presented, I am conscious of feelings as far as possible from dislike or prejudice toward the Massachusetts either of two hundred years ago or of to-day. I have sought facts, and have been led by them to conclusions. The explanations offered have been drawn from the laws of mind, the necessities of nature, and the analogies of history. It were an unwise and ungracious act to reproach Massachusetts even for its errors. My course has not been an attack: it has been a defence, or rather a rescue. The history of Maine had been obscured, disparaged, and even denied. I have thought it befitting the occasion to do what I could to redeem it from this oblivion, and restore it to its proper place and part. But nought has been set down in malice. The early acts of Massachusetts must not be judged by the laws of peace or the tests of abstract morality. Her acts were rather ordered according to the letter of positive law, and the grand tactics which are fair in war. Fighting for her life, and for the principles which made that life worth living, she pushed to the extreme boundary of her rights, and possibly also of her powers. Whether or not God pardons to mankind the errors of human history, we may believe He overrules evil for good, and makes even the wrath of man to praise Him. The old Bay Colony had strong faults, but it knew itself to be right at heart, and it builded even better than it knew.

It were no shame to be the daughter of Massachusetts, were such the fact. Those were men of deeds and daring for the right because it was the right, as they saw it. Many a royal lineage is less noble than that. Even to have been part of her is something to be proud of. And if our name

and worth were to be laid away among obscure foundation stones, I know of no fabric more glorifying the sacrifice, nor more glorified by it.

We are able then to say, that the high-handed acts of Massachusetts in Maine were indirectly and even directly beneficial. At all events, they contributed largely to separate Maine from England. If that was well, then all is well. Praise or blame whom we may, out of the conflict have come what we deem the best things—liberty and country.

In the first place I mention several ways in which she aided in preparing Maine to stand on the side of liberty in the great struggle. She was not unkind in her treatment of those who acknowledged subjection to her. She used Maine in her service, but she also served Maine. She promoted the establishment of great civil ideas,—education, morality, natural rights and social order; life, liberty, property, and equality before the law. She prepared the way especially for the great political ideas,—freehold tenure of land, and local self-government. I do not by any means say that Massachusetts had a monopoly of these ideas, or that Maine was merely missionary ground for her. The men who lived here had English notions of liberty and law. The courts set up under Gorges' authority strove to enforce moral and social order. They corrected abuses with a strong hand. They passed ordinances in the interest of education and religion, and reached one point which even the Puritans had not attained, when they ordered that all the children between the Piscataqua and Kennebec should be baptized.[1]

But many things had contributed to demoralize the inhabitants. One of the chief of these was the uncertainty and irregularity of government. No jurisdiction could be exercised without being questioned and contested. Hence disregard for authority, for law, and for morality itself. Massachusetts brought at least clearness and steadiness into the scene, and having that very essential attribute of a lawgiver —the power to enforce his precepts—she compelled obedience, and so compelled respect and secured peace. She began wisely, as Gorges lamented he had not. Almost her first act

[1] Massachusetts soon straightened this matter. She made it a punishable offence to baptise any children but those of church members, in Maine, although requiring it at home. Williamson I, 380. Willis' Portland, 162.

was to compel the towns all along the coast to make good, passable roads for vehicles.[1] In 1665 the local court under her authority presented all the towns from the Isles of Shoals to North Yarmouth, "for not attending the court's order for making a pair of Stocks, Cage and Cucking-stool."[2] Next, the court indicted the towns "for not taking care that their children and youth be taught the catachism and education according to law."[3] There was no lack of exercises for the enforcement of private morality. The "Scarlet Letter" figured freely here, and the records of court might furnish the novelists of the eighteenth century with favorite characters and situations, and enable even a Rabelais to enlarge his vocabulary. About the last act of the old Maine Province, before she lost her name and fame in Massachusetts Bay, was the passage of a liquor law, in the following decided form:

"In the Court of Sessions of the Peace for the Province of Mayne held at York July 15, 1690. Ordered, That from henceforth there shall not be any Rum or other strong Liquor or Flip sold unto any Inhabitant of the town by any Ordinary keeper therein, directly or indirectly, except in case of great necessity, as in case of sickness, &c." This was at a time when there was no legal or authorized government in Maine, nor even in Massachusetts; but we may cheerfully concede, that the influence of the latter would favor this measure. This however is by no means the earliest instance of a liquor law in Maine. That honor belongs to Pemaquid. At a Session of Council held under the authority of the Duke of York, September 11, 1677, was passed the following order,—which is in very plain Saxon, and besides the singular merit of suggesting a more radical principle for a temperance law than even that of the present day,—namely, to quit drinking,—carries a lesson of military as well as moral prudence;—"No Rum to be dranke on that side the ffort stands."[4] A noble watchword for the young soldier of society who stands for its defence!

So we cannot allow Massachusetts the motherhood of the Maine Liquor Law.

[1] Sullivan, 365. Willis' History of Portland, 165.

[2] This was an implement for applying cold water to ladies as an antidote for the effect of warm tea talks, and for scolds and scandal-mongers generally,—an instrument for which happily there now seems to be no occasion.

[3] York County records for 1676. [4] Pemaquid Papers, p. 19.

I spoke also of the political influence of Massachusetts. She made her politics felt. Many of the crimes of which the Court took cognizance were denunciations of the usurped authority itself. Contempt of court and evil-speaking of dignities were no light offences.[1]

The court at York (1665) finding that Jonathan Thing had spoken "discornfully of the Court," and had said he cared not for the Governor, he was censured to have twenty lashes on the bare back or redeem it with £12. Mr. Thomas Booth, slandering the powers that be, saying that they were a "company of Hypocritical Rogues, that feared neither God nor the King," the remark seems to have run him in debt to an extent which was cancelled by an entrance on the credit side of his ledger of an item of £5. Mr. Thomas Taylor (1670) was duly punished for abusing Capt. Raynes being in authority, by "*theeing and thouing of him.*" Mr. John Bonithon refusing to recognize the jurisdiction of the court, and intimating pretty plainly that it would not be a pleasant business to try to arrest him, was declared a Rebel, and it was ordered that if he could be taken he should be sent to Boston to answer for his conduct. This seems more like Star Chamber jurisdiction than the recognition of local self-government; but this was a hundred and thirty years before Jefferson announced the somewhat ambiguous maxim, 'that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.'[2] Mr. John Bonithon appears to have enjoyed a special revelation of this truth.

Contributions to Harvard were also a test of loyalty, as William Wardell found, "who being demanded whether he would give anything towards the College," answered that it was no ordinance of God, and he was arraigned by the Court therefor.[3]

Some of the judgments of the court, however, maintained the purity of the ballot without particular reference to the party exercising the government. Mr. Thomas Withers was convicted, 1691, of "Seruptitiously indeavoring to pervert

[1] There is nothing peculiar in this. A government of force must make its measures strong in proportion as its title is weak.

[2] In truth this maxim is an inadequate statement of the philosophy of government. That "consent" is the sober second thought—the deep, deliberate will—of the people as an organic body, and is not true of the constitutent elements as individuals.

[3] York Records, 1654.

the providence of God and priviledges of others by putting in several Votes for himself to be an officer at a Town meeting when he was intrusted by divers freemen to vote for other men," for which crime he was fined, or pilloried, and disfranchised.

But there were greater matters,—political—in which the influence of Massachusetts rendered important service to Maine. One of these is the freehold tenure of land. No one thing more disturbed and discouraged the settlers under the early charters of this territory than the feudal tenures of the soil—the old customs of lease-holds and quit-rents, which made a man feel like a stranger and an alien on the land he was working on. A man cannot be a man unless he has a place upon the earth which is his own, where he can build his home and his altar,—where he can stand and look up to God, offering his work and his worship with his own hand, and not through another's. Maine owes thanks to Massachusetts that she helped to deliver her from this bondage to feudalism. I must say here, as before, that she was not the first to introduce this idea, nor did she confer it as a completed gift. She did but concur with an instinct already powerful in the hearts of men. But her influence was great, and we thank her that she wielded it on the right side. She contributed also to advance ideas of popular government. Manhood suffrage, however, was not one of her peculiar ideas; nor in that exact phrase was it her idea at all. Her own rule was, that none but church members should be admitted to the electoral franchise. But the principle of local self-government was hers of all things in the world—hers of all people in the world. The very life and aim of her colony was a protest, to all the kingdoms of the earth, in behalf of that great principle. At the same time nothing could be farther from her notions of freedom than the doctrine that the right of suffrage is a natural right,—that is, a right in each man to participate in the government of others associated with him in the State. Her idea evidently was, that suffrage was not a right, strictly, but a franchise—a privilege conferred by the State, originating in the collective people and given or withheld at its mere will. But no matter for that; the great needs and instincts in the heart of man will determine facts, whatever we may do with theories. Concede to enlightened men

local self-government, and they will work out rights and regulate them. Massachusetts admitted none but church members to the freedom of the Commonwealth; but the reason of this rule was a reason why it should not be the rule in Maine; and she never made it so in the days of her power here. Her reason for the law at home was, "To the end the body of the freemen may be preserved of honest and good men." The aim and end explains the restriction. In Maine the aim did not demand the restriction, for the simple fact that the most honest and best men were not exclusively church members. Plymouth, a more democratic colony, had a restricted suffrage, quite complicated in its regulations.[1] And Charles II, when he undertook to resume the government of New England, in 1662, had "property" and "orthodoxy" among the qualifications of voters, in what he thought to be the most liberal of codes.[2] So I insist that Massachusetts in promoting the principles of self-government, laid the foundation for the equality of every man before the law, and of every freeman before the ballot box.[3]

There is no doubt that one thing which attached Maine to New England, and led her to cast her lot in with the fortunes of free America, was the influence of a Congregational church system. Whatever may be our church sympathies now, we must admit that religious sympathies at that time were powerful bonds of union. And whatever may be our particular creed, we must admit that even in this day of reactions and Old-World immigration, the prevailing church system of New England is Congregationalist. It may not be readily conceded that this is naturally more consonant with democratic

[1] Plymouth Col. Laws, p. 258.

[2] Hutchinson Coll. Papers, p. 379.

[3] A correct understanding of the electoral privilege is of so much importance amidst the confused or erroneous notions which still find place, —mistaking sovereignty of government for sovereignty of the people— that it may be worth while to state what seems to be the teaching of the Declaration of Rights in the Constitution of Maine, and the only sound American doctrine,—namely, that the right to vote is not a franchise,— a right conferred by the State, revocable at the will of the majority, or voidable by breach of contract; but a natural right of every free person as a member of the State, not as an individual, and having its qualifications only in those things which are necessary qualifications of such free person, whether they be physical or pecuniary independence, intelligence or anything else essential to constitute true personality. The State may regulate the exercise of this.

ideas of civil government than a high-church system is.[1] But at that time the lines of political and religious division being so nearly coincident, historical facts permit me to accord to the Puritan, and especially to the Pilgrim church, an honored place in the march of political freedom. I say the Pilgrims; for it is well known that the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay were not at first Separatists or Congregationalists. They were Churchmen, who wished reform within the Church, as were the great Puritan leaders in England,—Eliot, Hampden and Pym. The remarkable fact is, that the Puritans of Massachusetts who never yielded in anything else or to anybody else, yielded their church system to that of Plymouth. It was the Pilgrims, who reading the simple principles of christian and social organization on the open page of the New Testament, and holding fast to the plain formulas of that liberty, prevailed over all New England, and drew under its all-embracing fellowship many names and creeds. The grain of mustard seed became a tree, shooting out great branches, so that the birds of the air came and lodged under the shadow of it. It reached even into Maine, and that communion knit the hearts of the people together in one strong purpose, and bore them together through the sufferings and glories of the struggle for the rights of man. We honor the church of England, and are glad that she still has a peculiar reverence here on these shores where she was the earliest planted, and where she keeps the ancient light still burning, but we may well doubt whether had she held undisputed sway, Maine would not have stood fast by England unto this day.

Another way in which the intervention of Massachusetts prepared Maine to espouse the cause of American liberty is —paradoxical as it may seem—the liberty of conscience and freedom of worship which followed her hand. This, it is true, was as far as possible from her creed. But some whom she banished for conscience sake came hither, and the spirit of free inquiry which she repelled reacted upon her, so that in spite of herself she soon began to be what she has now be-

[1] I say this remembering that many of the Swiss Cantons are Roman Catholic, and that many of the great English patriots and defenders of liberty were strict churchmen, and even that the Church itself was the champion of freedom as against tyrants, royal or ecclesiastical, in memorable crises of history. I am not claiming that congregationalism is the mother of liberty, but that it is the brother of it.

come, a preacher of that which at first she persecuted. The patient and tolerant Pilgrim, the inly-lighted Quaker, the calm, brave Roger Williams, were powers felt to the farthest bound of Maine, as they were powers also in the shaping of New England character. Others are not to be forgotton, but as the true founders of religious freedom we give the palm to the Pilgrims—a prouder one than those so named of old bore home from Holy land.

The Pilgrims and Puritans in America were slow to come together. It is curious to note how near the Old Colony once came to being annexed to New York. When so much of New England was consolidated under the Province of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire and Rhode Island had influence enough to escape. It is not so well known that the Pilgrims of Plymouth also resisted the annexation. They too did not altogether relish the Massachusettss way of managing things. They sent an agent to England to guard their interests—Rev. Ichabod Wiswell, of Duxbury. Their aim, to be sure, was not so much to resist Massachusetts, as to obtain for Plymouth an independent charter. They so far succeeded, that when the commission of the Governor of New York was made out, Plymouth was actually included in his jurisdiction. This was afterwards changed by the Massachusetts' influence —especially that of Rev. Increase Mather, who claimed to be acting in the interests of Plymouth. But how the friends of the Colony deplored the result may be seen in Wiswell's letter home:

"All the frame of heaven," says the Pilgrim, "moves on one axis,[1] and the whole of New England's interests seem designed to be loaden on one bottom, and her particular motion to be concentric to the Massachusetts tropic. You know who were wont to trot after the Bay horse. I do believe that Plymouth's silence, Hampshire's neglect, and the rashness and influence of one who fled from New England in disguise by night[2] has not a little contributed to our disappointment."[3]

There was a wide difference between the Pilgrims and Puritans. The Plymouth people were Separatists as to Church

[1] This may be the origin of the epithet, "The Hub."

[2] Rev. Increase Mather.

[3] See Folsom's note, Me. Hist. Coll. II., p. 42; and Brigham's "New Plymouth and its Relations to Massachusetts." Lowell Inst. Lectures, 1869.

organization, but they were willing to live under the laws of England. The Puritans wished reform within the Church, but they were unwilling to live under the laws of England. Thus the Pilgrims were at first disposed to keep separate Church and State,[1] while it was the cardinal point in the Massachusetts Colony to unite Church and State.[2] In fact, precisely what they wished to do in this country, was to build up the State on the Church. They sought to erect a Bible Commonwealth, whose code would be drawn not from the Common Law of England, but from the Law of God as revealed in the Old and New Testaments.

Governor Winthrop must have understood the theory of the Colony. One emphatic sentence of his is to the purpose: "Whereas, the way of God hath always been to gather his churches out of the world; now the world,—or civil state, must be raised out of the churches."[3]

Mr. John Cotton, the first minister of Boston, is surely a competent authority to speak conclusively of their intention. In a letter to Lord Say and Sele he says, "Democracy, I do not conceive that ever God did ordain as a fit government either for church or commonwealth. If the people be governors, who shall be governed? As for Monarchy and Aristocracy they are both of them clearly approved and directed in Scripture, yet so as referreth the sovereignty to himself, and setteth up Theocracy in both, as the best form of Government in the Commonwealth, as well as in the church."[4]

[1] It was precisely because they wished to separate Church from State, that they became Separatists from the Church of England.

[2] Davenport's Life of Cotton contains the following explicit statement: "Considering that these Plantations had liberty to mould their civil order into that form which they should find to be best for themselves, and that here the churches and Commonwealth are complanted together in holy covenant and fellowship with God in Christ Jesus, Mr. Cotton did, at the request of the General Court in the Bay, draw an abstract of the laws of judgment delivered from God by Moses to the Commonwealth of Israel, so far forth as they are of moral, that is, of perpetual and universal equity among all nations; especially such as these Plantations are; wherein he advised that Theocrasie, i. e. God's government, might be established as the best form of government." Hutchinson's Coll. Papers, p. 161.

[3] "Reply" to Vane,—a rejoinder to a criticism on an Order of Court in 1637, conferring extraordinary powers on magistrates. Hutchinson's Collection, pp. 88, 89.

[4] Hutchinson, History Vol. I, apppendix. See also on the whole matter the able lecture of Dr. George E. Ellis, "Aims and Purposes of the Founders of the Massachusetts Colony." Lowell Institute Lectures, 1869.

Unjust blame and unjust praise have been lavished on the Puritans. This is because they have been charged, or credited, with purposes which they themselves never avowed. Friends and foes, equally zealous, and therefore equally prone to neglect a calm investigation of facts, have aided each other in misrepresenting the character and motives of those men. On the one side bound by local pride and the honor of blood to vindicate the fame of their fathers, and supported by the breadth and tolerance of the present christian spirit of Maschusetts, the defenders of the Puritans have held them up as champions of liberty of conscience, and founders of American "freedom to worship God." On the other side, the assailants directing attention to certain strong acts of religious persecution on the part of the Puritans, have denounced them as not only bigots, but hypocrites; professing freedom and practicing tyranny. But as matter of fact, they were intolerant without being inconsistent,—being indeed rigidly consistent and straightforward. They never pretended to be champions of liberty of conscience or religious freedom.

This matter has so much bearing on the main subject in hand, and the opinion here maintained is likely to be so reluctantly received, I must be permitted to set it forth somewhat more fully. Dr. Palfrey, in his history, which is the best defence of the early Massachusetts men, says it was their design "that their Colony should be a refuge for civil and religious freedom."[1] This is a surprising statement, which both makes history stultify itself, and presents the aim and purpose of that colony in a manner very different from that in which the leaders themselves put it. As to the acts of intolerance and persecution, wherever their power reached, there can be no occasion to recite their history.[2] But that their professions corresponded with their practices, and that they are thus vindicated from the charge of inconsistency, is

[1] Hist. New Eng. Vol. I, 314.

[2] There never were any persecutions for witchcraft east of the Piscataqua. Massachusetts had one trophy, however, in the case of Rev. George Burroughs,—a noted minister of Falmouth, who afterwards, at Salem, having been found guilty of holding at arm's length a seven-foot gun by his finger inserted in the muzzle, and likewise carrying about a barrel of molasses by the bung-hole, and by similar feats of sorcery disturbing the serenity of Mary Walcot, was judged unfit to live, and was executed as a witch. The indictment is a curiosity. Williamson, II. 21, gives part of it.

a fact which the candid student of history need not go far to seek. The famous John Cotton, in reply to Roger Williams' argument in favor of liberty of conscience, labors to prove the lawfulness of using the civil sword to extirpate heretics, from the command given to the Jews to put to death blasphemers and idolators. He says, "it is toleration which makes the world anti-christian, and even hypocrites and tares are better than briars and thorns;" and he advises to "destroy the bodies of those wolves who seek to destroy the souls of those for whom Christ died." Higginson, in his election sermon, 1663, speaks thus, "The gospel of Christ hath a right paramount to all rights in the world. That which is contrary to the Gospel hath no right, and therefore should have no liberty." Here the minister and the magistrate appear to wield the functions of judge and executioner.[1] Shephard's election sermon of 1672, skilfully makes a text of the cry of the demoniac, "Let us alone thou Jesus of Nazareth," which he styles "Satan's plea for Toleration," and whereupon he argues that toleration had its origin from the devil. The learned President Oakes, on the same occasion the next year, utters a similar sentiment: "The outcry of some is for liberty of conscience. This is the great Diana of the libertines of this age. But remember, that so long as you have liberty to walk in the faith and order of the gospel, you have as much liberty of conscience as Paul desired under any government." Still the minister or magistrate is to be the judge. A free-spoken man certainly was Rev. Nathanael Ward of Ipswich, who is said to be chief author of the famous "Bodie of Liberties."[2] In his quaint book, "The Simple Cobler of Agawam," written in 1647, he says: "He that is willing to tolerate any unsound opinion that his own may be tolerated, though never so sound, will for a need, hang God's bible at the devil's girdle. It is said that men ought to have liberty of conscience, and that it is persecution to debar them of it. I can rather stand amazed

[1] The terrors in which ministers in New England have been clothed, even up to recent times, seem to have arisen from the civil powers they had in the early society. The ministers did much more than "preach politics" in those days. But a hundred years later the "Pulpit of the Revolution" was a power in achieving political freedom.

[2] Bancroft says this will compare favorably with any bill of rights from Magna Charta down.

than reply to this; it is an astonishment that the brains of men should be parboiled in such impious ignorance."[1]

These citations, which fairly represent the sentiments of the leaders, are more than sufficient to show that the design of that colony was not to afford a refuge for civil and religious liberty, but to find a place where they might have liberty to hold themselves and others in rigid subjection to a code which they called christian, but which after all had a very Mosaic mode of execution.

The Massachusetts Colony was peculiar in this. The others were far more tolerant. Plymouth, formed in a different school, was ready to proclaim freedom indeed. In 1645, a majority of her house of delegates were in favor of an act to "allow and maintain full and free toleration to all men who would preserve the civil peace and submit unto government."[2] The Old Colony also received Roger Williams when banished by Massachusetts, until she compelled the Pilgrims to cast him out. As for Rhode Island, it was looked on in those days as the "sink of New England." It was a saying of the times, that if any man has lost his religion he may find it there among such a general muster of opiuionists.[3] Rhode Island, however, has an honored birth and history. And Plymouth has reason to be proud that her faith has conquered the force of her conqueror.

As to their relations, the language of the farewell address of the Massachusetts Colony would seem conclusive: "We do not go to New England as separatists from the Church of England; though we cannot but separate from the corruptions in it."[4] It is very apparent that the Massachusetts Company at first repelled the Separatists, who found refuge with the Pilgrims,—brothers as they were in faith and form. "We give you this order,"—says Craddock writing on behalf of the company to Governor Endicott of Rev. Ralph Smith, a Separatist who had taken passage for America,—"that unless he will be *conformable to our government* you suffer him not to remain within the limits of your grant." Bradford tells us

[1] Dr. Belknap cites many other evidences of this professed intolerance, and discusses the subject with admirable judgment and temper in his History of New Hampshire, Vol. I, chapter 3.

[2] See Bancroft I, 252. [3] Belknap's New Hampshire I, 89.

[4] Mr. Higginson's pathetic and noble speech on board the ship leaving England. See Mather's Magnalia, Book III, Part II, Chap. 1.

the rest.[1] Smith fled to Plymouth where he was kindly entreated, chosen to the ministry and honored in that office many years. What happened to Roger Williams, sent away not because he was a Baptist but because he was a Separatist —a believer in freedom of worship—we well know.[2] It was equally apparent that Massachusetts did not exactly fellowship with Plymouth. Cotton Mather speaks his opinion pretty boldly.[3] "About the time of Governor Bradford's death, religion itself had like to have died in that colony, through a libertine and Brownistick spirit then prevailing among the people, and a strange disposition to discountenance the gospel-ministry,[4] by setting up the "gifts of private brethren" in opposition thereunto.[5]

The very different objects of these two colonies—the one aiming at the upbuilding of a State, and the other at religious freedom—tended to keep them apart. But the spirit of christianity on which both rested their respective systems brought them together in one grand result; the truth had made them free, in thought and worship as well as in civil and political institutions—the dominant ideas of New England to-day.[6]

But one thing more remains to be said for Massachusetts. Whatever it be of christian charity, she had a perfect legal

[1] "Plymouth Plantation," Mass. Hist. Coll., 4th series, vol. 3, p. 263.

[2] The treatment of Robinson, Cudworth and Hatherly of Scituate, was similar, but is not so widely known. See History of Scituate, p. 246.

[3] Magnalia, Book II, Chap. I, Life of Bradford.

[4] The peril of the ministerial prerogative seemed to be the trouble here.

[5] As these sheets are passing to the press, "The Pilgrim Memorial," is placed in my hands, containing the elaborate lecture of Benjamin Scott, F. R. A. S., Chamberlain of the city of London, entitled "The Pilgrim Fathers neither Puritans nor Persecutors," in which the conclusions above presented are strongly corroborated. The only points beyond those given in the text which I need now refer to, are first, that the early Separatists were not Puritans, and were persecuted solely for desiring to separate Church from State and not for political treason;—the early martyrs Copping and Thacker in the reign of Elizabeth "died at Bury St. Edmunds, acknowledging the civil supremacy of the Queen, but maintaining that in spiritual matters they owed allegiance to another king, one Jesus;" and secondly, that the Puritans in England persecuted the Separatists, as is shown in the petition to the Privy Council by Puritan Clergymen, in which they say of the Brownists, "We abhor these, and we punish them," (pp. 22, 25.)

[6] New England owes what is best in its character and institutions to the plain teachings of the Bible, and it would not hurt us to study it more. The more we know of it, the more we know how to be free.

right to be intolerant. She did not deny to others what she claimed for herself. Her people sought the wilderness that they might live according to their own ideas. It was no hardship to the rest of the world from which they had fled, to be shut out. Their charter was so much prized because it gave them a safeguard and immunity almost as absolute as that wherewith the English law makes a man's house his castle. The charter gave them full and absolute power to "correct, punish, pardon and rule all who should come within their jurisdiction; and for their defence and safety to encounter, expulse, repel and resist by force of arms and by all fitting ways and means all persons who should attempt their destruction, invasion, detriment or annoyance." To be sure, they were restrained from doing anything repugnant to the laws of England. They gave their own interpretation to that, but it was simple, straightforward and logical, according to the reason and nature of the case. Liberty of conscience—freedom of thought—was the very thing they hated, and from which they had fled. To harbor these insidious foes, would be stultification and suicide. Intolerance was her only defence. You say this was bigoted and narrow? That may be true; but so is loyalty in the midst of treason. Their charter was obtained to secure them in the exercise of the religious life they chose. To this end they had a perfect right to exclude, or cut off, all spiritual as well as corporeal enemies,—Quakers, Baptists, Witches and Antinomians, as well as Indians, Frenchmen, Royal Commissioners and Governors. And it was in accordance with good tactics—legal as well as military—in which those men were by no means unskilled, not to wait until their foes were within their very doors, but to reach out and keep them at arm's length, and if need be to clear the surrounding region of every thing that could shelter an enemy's approach, or obstruct the range and effect of their own fire.[1] The Massachusetts of to-day is not responsible for their errors; but it has reason to be proud of their virtues. Nor is it altogether clear that it might not be better for us if

[1] Massachusetts made her hand felt elsewhere than in Maine. She undertook to exercise jurisdiction in Warwick, R. I., and even in New York; and in 1644 forbid the inhabitants of Exeter, N. H., from forming a church until the court at Boston or at Ipswich should give allowance therefor. Belknap I, 58.

some of that austere virtue would descend even upon this generation.

Massachusetts was intolerant; but it was by such right at least, as is the effect of law. And her intolerance was not of an evil nature, and so was not long abiding. It bore in itself the elements of its own correction. It was in the name of that obedience which saints and sages alike agree is "perfect freedom"—that obedience to the right which is the law of liberty. She stood for the right as she saw it, and even though in some things wrong, she cherished a truth which in due time would make all men free who followed it. Her watchword was not Liberty, but Loyalty;—and this, being such as it was, led to true liberty. She kept her rigid Law, but slumbering in its prophecy was that better Gospel which came not to destroy but to fulfil.

There is no more mistaken notion than that the New England of to-day is the simple outgrowth of the Puritan ideas and practices of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. It is, on the contrary, the remarkable fact that the distinctive principle of that colony is precisely what has been most changed. The religious freedom of which we boast was the very thing which the fathers of that colony denied. The New England which has grown up is not that for which they suffered and struggled, and which they hoped so earnestly to see. This has grown up from the mingled elements of all the colonies, based indeed upon the living truths of the Bible, but illuminated by the Sermon on the Mount, rather than by the lightnings of Sinai. It has grown out of the charities of one fundamental faith, the sympathies of a common blood and the conciliations of a common cause. New England has influenced Massachusetts as much as she has influenced it. The Puritans were forced to see their failure going on in their own consecrated colony, and under their very eyes; and a different spirit,—more broad, more liberal, more human, yet as loyal to great principles,—gradually overruling their own; a spirit, a character, which not Massachusetts and New England alone, but the whole country, from the lakes to the gulf, and from ocean to ocean, recognizes as mighty among the powers that have made this nation what it is.[1]

[1] One-third the entire population of the United States in 1834 were descendants of the Puritans and Pilgrims.

I have said so much of Massachusetts because Maine was for forty years under her power, and for one hundred and thirty years more a constitutent element of her estate and name. Her encroachments upon Maine were unwarranted by law, and high-handed in morality, and have only a military justification. But the result was to give order where there had been confusion, law where there had been license, and liberty where there had been formalism. In the later times her people largely emigrated to this province—especially of those more liberal in sentiment, more independent and enterprising in spirit. And so the old Bay State is more a mother to us in this circumstance than in any other,—that she contributed some of her own best and bravest sons and daughters to make up the robust character of Maine. But it was Plymouth after all which was the true "refuge of civil and religious freedom," and which by her influence cast abroad the potent seeds that found in Maine a ready and genial soil. The ancient kindness was richly returned when for the bread once sent to the famishing Pilgrims, came back in due time that spirit which is life's law and liberty.[1]

I pass by many interesting episodes,—such as the struggle of D'Aulney and La Tour to carry Acadia to the banks of the Penobscot, and speculations upon the motives and results of New England's driving away the Dutch who had gained a footing there. I omit also to bring forward as they deserve some matters of abiding history,—such as the settlement of the Dutch and Germans between the Penobscot and Kennebec, and of the Scotch and Irish and French even, who form no unworthy tracery in the thoroughly English character of our people. I am not giving a history of Maine, but only tracing the action of those formative forces which cast the great lines of our political history as they are.

The charter of William and Mary tended to bring the colonies together, to modify extremes, to promote unity of interest and aim in people who were already of one blood and birthright. A common enemy and a common defence strengthened this tendency. Almost a century of wars, borne

[1] It is no strange or meaningless concurrence of ideas that the beautiful statue of Faith for Plymouth Hill—looking out seaward and pointing heavenward—is now being wrought from the pure white granite of Maine, and almost within the bounds of that early Pilgrim Grant on the Kennebec.

in suffering and in triumph together, knit hearts as one. The brunt fell upon Maine, the vast frontier and flying-buttress of New England,—her soil the battle ground and her sons the vanguard. I have said before, that the fleet which took Port Royal was manned chiefly here and commanded by her distinguished son, Sir William Phipps. I have spoken of the famous siege of Louisburg, where almost the whole English armament were men of Maine, from the cabin and drummer boy to the Chief Commander, Sir William Pepperell. On land, also, Maine bore her part in every expedition, and shared the crowning glory on the Heights of Abraham. Such was the drain upon her in these French wars, that there was not left at home one man to a family, and Massachusetts was forced to send at one time a hundred men to garrison the little forts that protected the trembling homes.

But when the dearly defended liberties of the colonies were threatened by the mother country herself, decimated Maine was among the first to spring to the defence. "Our swords have not grown rusty," said the town of Gorham: "We offer our lives a sacrifice in the glorious cause of liberty," were the ringing words of Kittery;—in 1773, two years before Lexington and Concord. And on the muster rolls of the alarm men, called out by that momentous day, the names of the men of Maine flash like electric sparks all the way from Kittery to Mt. Desert. Soon after, the patriots of Machias under the O'Briens, boldly attacked a king's ship, the Margaretta, and after a sharp engagement "the British flag was struck for the first time on the ocean to Americans."[1]

I cannot be expected here to sift the history of those momentous years, and present to you the part which Maine bore in the "times that tried men's souls." I wonder that this history has not yet been written, and that our State has not gathered from the Massachusetts rolls, at least the names which even at this late day would shed glory upon her own. Let me simply say, that in that struggle, Maine, drained as she had already been in the bloody French and Indian wars, lost a thousand men. And when it was over, the burden of the public debt that fell upon her was greater in proportion to her wealth and population, than her share in the cost of the War of the Rebellion.[2]

[1] Bancroft, Hist. U. S., centenary edition, Vol. IV, p. 456.
[2] Varney's History of Maine.

It was owing to causes that lay far deeper than the consolidating charter of Massachusetts Bay, that these colonies were merged into one. Nor is it wholly true, as is so often said, that it was the War of Independence which made them one. It is equally true, at any rate, that their oneness made their independence. Though existing under different and sometimes adverse charters—though grouped around different centres, with circumferences sometimes in collision, they were steadily evolving that consciousness of identity which is the soul of a nation. By all their sacrifices and toils and struggles,—by all their traditions, convictions and hopes,—by all that history gives to character and character to history, they were working out those ideals set forth in the Declaration, the Constitution and the Union, and in which are centered the glory of America and the hopes of humanity. And Maine has had no inglorious share in this. Conservative though she was from the beginning, she was never behind the foremost when the rights of man were at stake,—whether they were to be attested by patient continuance in well doing, or decided by the costly arbitrament of arms.

There is no doubt that during all this revolutionary period Massachusetts had treated Maine with kindness, and had conciliated many people who before had resisted her usurpation. But there were many in this region whose sympathies still lingered with the mother country,—who did not perceive that the fight here was for Englishmen as well as for Americans, and for man the world over. Had not Maine been incorporated with the rest of New England by the charter of '91—had she been left impoverished and desolated as she was, to defend herself in the struggle, there is no doubt that the English perceiving the great strategic advantages of the position, would have seized upon the territory, and overawed the inhabitants, as she did in Nova Scotia; and when at last the lines were drawn, they would have included that Dukedom of York once bounded by the Kennebec, or that Palatinate of Gorges by the Piscataqua, which would have made that river the eastern boundary of the United States. As it was, I cannot but wonder that Great Britain did not seize this ground, and entrench herself here, where she might have held a flanking position of the whole American coast,—where she could have rendezvoused her fleets and armies, and made this storied shore the front of a new Empire. Had this

been done the Dominion of Canada to-day would have a different fame and a different capital. It needs no diviner's eye to see what use would then be made of the mighty waters of the Penobscot and Kennebec, or such imperial naval stations as Somes' and Hussey's sounds; or what city would then arise, not to be scorned when it claimed to be "the natural seaport of the Canadas."

But it was otherwise. Hearts and fortunes have turned elsewhere and are bound to a different fate. The blood of Maine runs in the veins, or has endeared the sod, of every State in the Union: her star is not the least in the flag of the free, nor her name the humblest of those that mark the homes of the brave. And that she has a place in this proud greeting of the Century of the Republic I doubt not she owes to the fact that she was once part and parcel of the Province of Massachusetts Bay.

The remaining division of this discourse will regard Maine as an independent State. She had not indeed been dependent. By the charter of William and Mary she was a constituent part of Massachusetts, as much so as Plymouth or Boston itself. And when independence of England was declared, Massachusetts and Maine spoke as one. Only a small portion of her territory had ever been a Province of Massachusetts—the Gorges Palatinate—and that only for a short time. District she was indeed,—not of Massachusetts, but of the United States. For the better administration of maritime affairs Congress in 1779 made Maine a separate District, with a United States Court and officers as now. But the old feeling of self-determination was still strong; and with all the kindliness, the feeling of the right of self-government was not quenched. Territorially at least, the union was unnatural. The War of the Revolution brought the need of a distinct government to a sharp edge. So early as 1785 public meetings and conventions were held to consider the expediency of a separation. The growth of the State also increased the demand. From a population of five thousand at the beginning of the century she had advanced to more than seventy-five thousand at the time of the Revolution, and at the close of the century her population exceeded a hundred and fifty thousand. At this rate of increase the necessity for a separation was growing ever stronger. But the assertion of it

was not promoted by the same ratio: for much of this increase had been by immigration from Massachusetts and the rest of New England; and many of those who had contended stoutly for the rights and interests of Maine had removed beyond her borders after Massachusetts took possession; and especially during and after the Revolution the Loyalists gradually retired eastward,—first across the Penobscot, and then beyond the St. Croix.[1] So it happened that the parties on the question of separation were for many years nearly balanced.

But the war of 1812 brought many changes. Maine contributed her part; but of stirring events here there is not much to tell. The English directed several of their attacks upon this coast, which was poorly defended; and it is fair to say that our military operations were not brilliant. The sea fight off Seguin, however, was a bright spot upon the scene; and a gallant enterprise in capturing a British privateer off Bristol, redounded to the credit of that neighborhood.

Maine was a commercial State. Her shipping amounted to 150,000 tons: her exports to almost a million dollars a year. But many of her sons were sailors and liable to impressment by British cruisers. The war and the embargo increased party feeling, and strangely tasked it. The war-spirit and the war-measures brought conflicting motives into the same minds—self interest and patriotic pride. The latter prevailed. The majority sustained the government. One good effect of the war and its measures was to stimulate local industries. The manufacture of woolen, cotton, glass and metal, started up with vigor all over the State, and made a large demand and quick market for farm products of every kind. But at the close of the war the influx of foreign goods brought in a competition which stopped the factories, and caused great loss and discouragement. The inevitable result was a reduction in the demand for agricultural products, and in the wages of labor. Severe winters and late springs still more disheartened the farmers. These causes led to that notable rush to the West in 1815 and 1816, known as the "Ohio fever," by which the State lost 15,000 of her most energetic people.

Meantime the question of separation had become a party issue,—the Federalists adhering to Massachusetts, the Repub-

[1] A very valuable Article, and one in which every candid mind can afford to be interested, is the Historical Essay of Lorenzo Sabine in his "Loyalists of the American Revolution."

licans contending for independence.[1] In 1820 the point was carried; and that connection which was begun in violence, but had been continued for a hundred and thirty years in growing good-will, was now ended without severing the warm ties of blood—the unshed dearer for that which had been shed. A majority had decided it, but from henceforth Maine was one. By the mysterious laws of transmission, traces of this same majority have characterized the public sentiment of Maine in all great crises, if I might not even say they have made her marked in character. Maine is conservative, self-reliant, calm; slow even, to wrath or novelty. She will lead in a noble cause when convinced; but she is not fanatical, narrow nor self-seeking. She does by no means always follow Massachusetts—nor even New England. But it would be a great mistake to suppose Maine is not warmly one with New England in all great principles and interests. It would be a mistake to suppose that Maine, advanced post and vanguardsman as she is, on this cold northeast frontier, does not keep in her soul the watchword of the Union, and feel the heart-beat of the whole body of the nation.

It would seem that the portion of the State north of the old Gorges' Palatinate, was never subject of grant to any party, and if that is the case the title to that portion of the territory was vested directly in the United States by the treaty of 1783 with Great Britain, and was virtually transferred to Maine on her admission to the Union. There was, however, for many years a contest, sometimes sharp and threatening, as to the Northern and North Eastern Boundary. The result, although apparently unsatisfactory to England, was felt by Maine people to be for the advantage of the United States at the expense of Maine. At any rate, her claim was not defended, and in lieu of the territory thus lost

[1] These party names furnish a striking instance of misnomer; and what is still more remarkable, one of these parties adopted the name of their original opponents. It was in reality the Nationalists who came to be called Federalists. They held to the unity of the nation as opposed to a confederacy, and were led by Hamilton and Jay, who joined by Madison, wrote the articles called "The Federalist," which supported the new federal constitution. The old Federals, supporters of the ideas of the Confederation, were afterwards, with Jefferson for leader, known as Republicans, and then as Democrats. In addition to the familiar sources of information on this subject, we have now the recent work of Von Holst, "Constitutional and Political History of the U. S.," and Bateman's "Political and Constitutional Law of the U. S."

the United States received a "far more valuable tract" on Lakes Champlain and Superior,[1] and Maine a mere nominal equivalent in money.[2]

The population of the new State was nearly 300,000. The leading industries were lumbering, agriculture and ship building. While the natural resources were yet abundant, the returns from these industries were large. Wealth and population rapidly increased. Up to the year 1850, each decade showed an average gain of 80,000 inhabitants.[3] From that time a decided slackening begun. The census of 1860 showed a decrease of the former rate of advance by one-half, and that of 1870 no advance at all, but a loss in the aggregate population, of 1,364. New Hampshire is the only other State which shows a falling off in the last decade. Her loss is remarkable, being 7,872 upon a total of 326,000. This might look as if this corner of the country were really too hard a place to live in, and New England was literally to be left out in the cold. But let us see. Statistical tables may be made to support the most diverse conclusions. We may derive advantage, however, from an examination of the census returns and the reports of leading interests, and be able to make certain generalizations showing at least our faults and their causes, and which way our hopes lie.

The first fact which strikes us is, that while our general falling off is 1,364, our polls—the number of men of voting age—have increased in the last decade by the surprising figure of 16,396. The second fact is, that the aggregate wealth of the State has increased in that time $158,000,000. So if we are losing numbers, we are gaining in mature men. If there are fewer of us, we are learning to work better. In fact not only the total product, but the portion retained as the profits of business and wages of labor,—that is to say, the *wealth* of Maine has largely increased. In the last twenty years her gain has been $225,000,000. Even now, when lumber and shipping have so declined, her wealth goes steadily on.

[1] I acknowledge here the courtesy of the Historical Society in placing in my hands the extremely valuable papers of the late Senator George Evans, relating to this subject; as also some able papers on the British side, which lament the impolicy and weakness of England in not seizing the whole of the State of Maine, or at least Acadia to the Kennebec. The writer was an abler man than the British treaty-commissioner.

[2] $150,000.

[3] Increase for the two decades, 1790–1810, 55,000 each; to 1830, 75,000 each; to 1850, over 100,000 each.

Now, we may have courage to search for the weak spots—to find where the destroyer has been at work upon us. In the first place, we find it is not women we have lost—or at any rate "females," for in this valuable product the tables show a gain of 2,700 and more—900 in excess of the male population. But in 1860 the males were 6,000 more than the females. So it would appear we have less males in 1870 than we should have by 8,700 at the least. But the tables gave us a gain of polls of 16,396. This severe loss, then, must be found in males under the age of 21 years. Reluctant to accept the conclusion, we turn to the report of the School Commissioner,[1] and find that during the decade ending in 1870, the number of persons of school age in this State had decreased by 15,753! He accounts for this, partly as an indirect effect of the war which took away nearly half our male population between 20 and 40 years of age; and partly by the diminution from physiological or moral causes, in the birth rate of our native population. Moreover, the census returns[2] from an entirely different source, confirm this account—showing from 1860 to 1870 a thousand a year less children born in Maine than for any year of the twenty preceding. This truly is a conclusion and state of things which demands the serious attention of our public teachers and statesmen—guardians of the commonwealth and weal.

But we may see further into this matter and approach nearer a solution of it by taking another road. The statistics of industry ought to bear upon this subject; for while it is labor that produces wealth, it is the kind of labor and not the amount of it which tells most effectually on human society.

In this view let us examine the present drift of a few characteristic industries of Maine.

We find that the lumber business, which was once the great industry of Maine, has fallen off so that it is more than equalled by the single and comparatively recent industry of cotton manufacture,—the value of each product being about $12,000,000. Turning to another great staple of Maine, shipbuilding, we find the total annual product of the different works concerned in this to be $2,238,000, already much surpassed by many industries hitherto not made of much account;—the single item of iron-working producing an

[1] Report, Com. of Education 1871, p. 202.

[2] Census of 1870, Vital Statistics.

annual value of $3,597,714: boot and shoe making, $3,750,000: flouring mills, $4,415,000: leather-making, almost $5,000,000, and woolen factories $6,150,000. There are more than one hundred and thirty other mechanical and manufacturing industries with an annual product of more than $34,000,000.

Now take the third and chief industry of Maine. We find the total value of all farm products,—including stock, to be $33,470,044, while the total value of manufactured products,—I mean those which depend upon steam and water power—is $79,497,521, or much more than double that of agricultural products. The total number engaged in agriculture is 82,011, of whom fifty-five are females. The total engaged in the manufacturing industries are 62,077, of whom 12,742 are females. We will now compare the amount of wages in these occupations respectively. In agriculture $2,803,292; in manufactures $14,282,205. From these returns we are warranted in several inferences.

Industry is becoming more diversified. The powers of nature are being substituted for human muscle. The productiveness of labor is greatly enhanced. The returns of labor are greater: wages are rising. Manufactures are giving remunerative employment to a large number of women.

All this is well, and betokens advance of civilization. But the balance ought not to be so against agriculture, and farm wages ought not to be so low. In a healthy state of things, diversity of occupations should stimulate the home market, and advance the value of farm products and farms, and the character of farming.

But it would seem from these tables that there is a prevailing notion that mind and skill can only be rewarded by trade and manufactures; and the local demands for skilled labor being supplied, our youth have gone forth to other States where capital invites hands guided by brains, and work and wit give quicker returns.

Is this so? Let us see where they have gone. Evidently not where they can find more work, but higher work. Some to be sure, to the new lands of the West where nature is more prodigal; 8,000 to Wisconsin, 7,000 to Illinois, 6,000 to Minnesota,—but 43,000 to Massachusetts, 11,000 to New Hampshire, 10,000 to California; and so on, till we find more than 116,000 Maine-born people residing elsewhere in 1870.

Something of this is due to a general westward push, which seems to be an instinct of man; and Maine being farthest east of the States is most exposed to the attraction. Every thing is west of her; drawing like a magnet. But this does not account for our case. The fact of the matter is, that in our way of doing business Maine has become an old and exhausted State, before her true wealth has begun to be developed. We have been stripping off what was easiest to take, without mercy and without forethought. We have been acting the part of the barbarian and the savage whose highest reach of industry and commerce is to send away the raw products of Nature, as long as they hold out, and then hunt for new hunting grounds. The nation that relies solely on the sale of her raw products will find that when they are gone, she is gone. Until quite recent times our views of industrial economy have been perverse and ruinous, and this is one of them. Nowhere in the world of life is robbery blessed. You may indeed dig out the rock and the ore and give nothing back. That will do while it lasts. But true production is reciprocity; interests balance and support each other. What you borrow from *life*, you must repay. It is right no doubt to avail ourselves of the gratuities of nature. But you may be blind and brutish about it. Always you must consider the extent of her stores and her powers of recuperation. Otherwise you will sap her life, and leave her and yourself at the end wretched companions in poverty. So Maine has been stripping her forests and murdering her land; shipping away the fertility of her soil, and the stuff which she should have made material for her own ingenuity and skill; snatching at the near advantage, and heeding not what was to come.

In this way she was contributing to the superiority of others over herself. While she was honestly holding on to the good old, hard old ways, others had harnessed the forces of nature to their team, and were driving on apace. Mind had seized on *forces* as well as *matter*, and with these the cunning hand could do the work of scores. While others were cutting their way to wealth with the skilled knife and chisel and lathe, she was content with the narrow axe and cross-cut saw. Steam and iron ran away from the spinning-wheel and loom; and the women of the household being unable to turn their industry to good account, one hand of home labor was cut off.

No one could call our people lazy. They have been industrious; nay, hard workers. But they have acted as if the only law of labor was hard work. They have been slow to see that true labor seeks not simply where it can find obstacles to overcome, but how it can work most advantageously—where mind can best win mastery over the utilities of nature. Hard labor is a prison sentence; skilled labor is the enfranchisement of man. Hard labor keeps man in bondage to nature; skilled labor makes her his willing and strong servant. Hard labor uses man as a brute only; skilled labor almost lifts brute force to human.

Maine has been slow to learn this lesson. To make matters worse she for a long time cherished an insane prejudice against "corporations," as if they were despots of society and adversaries of souls. She did not see that this was to fight against capital, the instrument that serves labor,—against enterprise, the force that moves labor,—against mind, the power that exalts it.

Now at last—late, but we hope not too late—we have learned the lesson of true economy. We no longer oppose capital. We invite skill. We understand that diversification of industries, division of labor and the utilization of the forces of nature as well as the materials, is the way to wealth and the law of growth.

The great instrument of civilization is power,—mechanical power—mastery given to human hands over material forces, that human beings may be emancipated from drudgery and sent up to ever higher planes of labor and life. That is in the order of Providence the redemption from the curse,—the deliverance of man from bondage. For this he is to subdue the earth. Not that he shall ever be released from labor; for labor,—that is, the application of power, is life itself, but that nature by *his mind and skill* shall become a perfect instrument, with which he shall work out his truest ends, and win the mastery which is unto noblest service. The blind forces of nature thus have part in man's enfranchisement.

Now one great thing to say of Maine is, that she is full of power. In literal truth she overflows with it. The water power of Maine is mighty and exhaustless. More wonderful and useful still, in that it is available, controllable, constant. This land after many vicissitudes of elevation and subsidence

from the ocean level,[1] now lifts to a mean elevation of 600 feet[2] above it more than 1,600 lakes, covering more than 2,300 square miles of surface,—immense storage of power, kept ever fresh by the mists from the mingling Gulf stream and the Arctic currents, rolled back against the mountains and shed down the slopes in ever renewing course. Innumerable streams and noble rivers, not cutting through soft rock to level cañon beds with lazy flow, but precipitated over flinty faces that were hardened in the fires of centuries ago, and will not yield their place for centuries to come, bear these waters onward to where the ocean tides and storms have worn deep harbors inward to the very foot of the falls. How many of these powers there are cannot be estimated; but the great rivers in their descent to the sea yield a gross power equal to 6,600,000 horse. This power concentrated and utilized as is done in our factories, would be equal to the labor ten hours a day every working day in the year, of more than 80,000,000 men. This indicates in what direction our industries are to extend, and is a prophecy of what Maine is yet to be.

And she is favored in other respects for manufacturing. The sea winds bring salubrious airs; the drainage banishes malarial taints, and even the cold is of good account. The high heats of summer must always be a drawback to any extensive scale of manufactures in the South. You can shut out cold, but not so easily heat. It has been calculated that the diminished productiveness of factory labor in the South compared with that in the North, due to this cause, reaches the remarkable figure of ten per cent.[3] But our winters bring even more direct profits. Maine not only quarries stone, but ice. Here is a kind of export of raw material

[1] The account of the last great uplifting given in Dana's Geology, p. 561, Edition of 1875, has an interesting note on the Indian shell heaps, and the Quahaug and Oyster of Maine. It is supposed that the Labrador current was once turned aside by the closing of the Straits of Bellisle and a union of Newfoundland with the continent.

[2] This is the estimate of Walter Wells in his "Water Power of Maine," a work evincing an ability and genius deserving better notice. The first part of this work ought to be republished as a text-book for our schools.

[3] Wells' Water Power of Maine.

which will not impoverish. If her rock and her cold can be turned to wealth, she has an inexhaustible resource.[1]

Great manufacturing interests demand capital. We have missed the golden opportunities when investments were offered from abroad. Now manufactures have gained a better footing elsewhere, and there is said to be already an over production of the great staples. For this we must be patient,—work our way and pay our way. But I am not so much troubled for that. It does not appear to me that the only manufactures we should long for are the great ones which bring in crowds of foreign operatives who do not understand our institutions, and who do not enter into our social life and well-being. My hope for Maine lies largely in those many minor industries already referred to, that are pressing into service natural motors and native skill all over the State. It is with these diversified industries, that the true prosperity of our agriculture is vitally connected. An agriculture which depends only on foreign export will not reach the highest degree of profit and independence. Not to insist upon that general law that money flows in the same direction as raw materials,—that is, from the producing countries towards the great industrial and business centres,—I urge only the more obvious maxim, that diversified industries, widely scattered in local centres, which create a near and constant market, and secure within this domestic circle all the advantages claimed for reciprocity and free trade, afford the most favorable conditions for a prosperous agriculture. Thus the factory and the farm should balance. All that which is product of the farm would be worked to its highest form and use, and all that, brought from near or far,

[1] The decided change of climate between the region north of Cape Cod and that south of it, is often noticed. The cape in fact appears to be the index on the dividing line of two zones. The curious reasoning of Dr. Holyoke (Transactions Am. Acad. of Arts and Sciences, Vol. II, Pt. I,) that it is the great number of evergreens in our woods which causes our cold,—a reasoning thought so satisfactory by Judge Sullivan, (History of Maine, p. 8) cannot now be relied on to explain the decided and inveterate habit of winter to have its own way with us. Dr. Kohl puts the case for Maine with judicial mildness: "The nature of its climate inclines more to the countries north of it, than to the States south of Cape Cod." The reason he gives (Discovery of the East Coast, p. 44) is that the Arctic current branches off and circulates in the Gulf of Maine, while the warm Gulf Stream tempers the airs of the more southerly New England shores.

which is waste and refuse to the factory, return health and wealth to the soil. So every advantage not only of soil and material resources, but also of native aptitude, tact and skill, the division of labor, the association of capital and the rapid circulation of wealth, would tend to the stability, the upbuilding, the broad culture and total well-being of the State.

But we have not mastered all the lesson yet. We shall not have firm footing till we have learned to turn a real attention to husbandry. Not without deep meaning was that old fable of Antæus, the giant wrestler who could bear every hurt and come off victor in every struggle, because his strength was renewed whenever he touched the mother earth; and was only overcome when Hercules lifted him and crushed him in the air. So it is with man. And so with the State. It stands on its land. If it slights or abuses that, its strength is gone. Well might Disraeli ask, what has become of the yeomanry of England, that made her ancient fame? And well may we ask, Why is it that she, the richest, is yet the poorest nation in christendom, and the distance between her classes is ever widening?[1] One answer will do for all. She has driven off the small owners and free-holders from the soil and forced them into the shops and factories,—competition keeping wages down, and low wages crushing the last trace of God's image out of humanity. The fields that once supported men and women and children, sound in body and in soul, have been turned into sheep-walks and deer-parks, and gathered into the hands of a few, till seven hundred men own a quarter of England, and there are only 200,000 persons who could be called land-owners at all.[2] Then the tax system of that

[1] This is no random rhetoric. Any one familiar with English social science,—or even with modern English novelists, for that matter,—will recognize the truth implied in my question. A note to prove this truth would swell to the dimensions of a whole discourse. Essays on this topic are numerous. I refer to one of much value and interest, not widely known among us: "The Land Laws of England," by C. Wren Hoskyns, Esq., published among the Essays of the Cobden Club, entitled "Systems of Land Tenures in Various Countries," London, 1876.

[2] Mr. Mulford's statement in the "The Nation," p. 67, 'that one-half England is owned by 150 proprietors and the whole number is reduced to 30,000'—a statement which has been long current—was based on reports which have turned out to be unreliable. An analysis in the "London Times," April 7, 1876, shows that 874 owners hold 9,367,133 acres; 2,689 owners hold 14,896,324 acres; 10,207 owners hold 22,013,208 acres; 42,524 owners hold 28,840,550 acres.

country makes this matter worse. The tax that ought to be almost prohibitory on lands so held for human pride and aggrandizement, is made merely nominal, and that on income but a trifle. The burden of the tax is laid on consumption—on the human body, instead of on profits and property.[1] That answers the question. That is why England, though Empress of India, and though her colonies and commerce encircle the earth, is yet declining in civilization,—if we mean by that the art and power to command the blessings of nature. Tried by the maxim of her Bentham,—"The greatest good of the greatest number,"—her system has been found wanting. Her wealth does not save her, though she is the banker of the nations. Her manufactures do not save her, though she is the workshop of the world. A fatal error is at her heart, which makes even her christianity ineffectual. She has taken the standing-place out from under the feet of her people, and her whole moral order is overturned.[2]

Thank Heaven, we have not come to that. Our people are not wretchedly poor, but they are moving away. Our lands are not usurped by a few. They are abandoned by the many. But part of the result is the same. If we have not the misery, we have the desolation. It is a great evil and a hurt to have these farms stripped and forsaken, and these resources which might by earnestness and skill be made to warm and brighten

Hon. George C. Brodrick in his essay on the "Law and Custom of Primogeniture," (Cobden Club Essays, 1876,) canvasses the land statistics of England for that year with much clearness and insight. He finds that "nearly one-eighth of all the enclosed land in England and Wales is in the hands of 100 owners; that nearly one-sixth is in the hands of less than 280 owners; and that above one-fourth is in the hands of 710 owners."

[1] Here is the estimate for 1876: Land Tax, £2,000,000; Income, £3,900,000; Custom, Excise and Licences, (tax on consumption), £58,000,000. "Statesman's Manual for 1876," p. 215.

Mr. Greg,—"Essays on Political and Social Science," Vol. I, p. 248, Principles of Taxation,—argues that the poor in England do not pay their fair proportion of taxes, because the rich consume more of the necessaries of life than the poor.

[2] I have sought in vain for even an approximate estimate of the land owners in the United States. But we may compare France with England. According to M. de Lavergue, "Economie Rurale de la France," there are 7,500,000 land proprietors in that country. Well may Mr. Cliffe Leslie say, "The contrast between the land systems of France and England is the most extraordinary spectacle which European society offers for study to political and social philosophy." (The Land System of France, p. 288.)

many a home, left as they have been in the cold clutch of nature.

Consider for a moment certain great and beautiful economic laws:

1. As man advances, the prices of manufactured articles go down, and those of agricultural products go up.

2. In a healthy state of things, all values whatever,—necessities, luxuries, silver and gold even, interest and profits,—tend to decline, except raw material and wages. Land and labor—man and earth—therefore, stand together.

Where these results or tendencies do not appear, something is wrong. If "goods" are high, and wages and farm products low, there is an evil power at work. And the declining value of our farms tells a sad, true story against us. It is a thing we can see without census reports, that our youth have had a tendency within the last ten years to fly from labor to what they call business and trade,—being led to think, perhaps, that Exchange is a higher sphere of effort than Production.[1]

Unskilled farming, unpaid toil and heavy taxes, have added an impulse to this attraction. We want manufactures. But one interest must not oppress the other. Balance is the wisdom of society. If to atone for past errors you attempt to invite manufactures by exempting them from taxation, and roll that burden upon the little farms, you drive off the sons from the homesteads into the Babylon of the marts and cities. We must call our youth home again. If need be, exempt the old farm from taxation, instead of the new factory. Do not put a light tax on timber-lands and heavy one on homes. Favor those who own to cultivate, rather than those who hold

[1] There are two kinds of trade,—one which adds to values, and so is truly productive; another which takes toll out of values, and is simply destructive. The merchant who gathers various things from far places, and stores and holds them subject to our demand, saves us the immense expense of time and money in travelling, searching and transporting each for himself; and this is the same in effect, it will be readily seen, as adding directly to values. It is obvious that the number of such merchants has a natural limit in the amounts necessary for the needs of customers. There is another kind of trader who does not add to values,—who simply intercepts things as they pass from the producer to the consumer, and levies an Algerine tribute upon them. It is obvious that this class is worse than useless. In disturbed times such as we have had, this class increases without law or limit, and seems to thrive at the expense of society.

for speculation. Encourage the men and women who own their land to build up homes and rear up children, and draw out a perpetual blessing from the soil and sky, and so make earthly toil win heavenly harvests. That is what we must come to. Home again! We shall not have "good times" until speculation and trade give place to the creation of real values—until the captive children return from Babylon and build again the walls of Jerusalem. We must come back and touch mother earth again and be strong.

Then too there are broad fields yet to be taken up; for the rich resources of Maine stretch as far inland as the whole sweep of the shore. There are no fairer grain-fields in all the Western prairies than on the Aroostook highlands. The little band of Swedes we took pains to plant there return the cost of the enterprise in the example they have set us. A ship-load of such men and women is better than warehouses full of foreign luxuries. Doubtless we shall hear more of their virtues when they have votes to give. With sound thoughts and purposes bearing upon opportunities like these, we may be able to hold back at least some eddy in the westward sweeping tide of emigration. And if not, we may still console ourselves with the thought that even though the course of Empire tends westward, it is born of the East.

But mind—has not Maine been rich in that? Yes, to overproduction. That is to say she has produced more mind than she has had fit work for. Statesmanship was for a long time almost the only sphere which allowed scope for ambitious spirits, without banishing them from their homes. Others following the great laws of mental economy sought fields abroad. And was it not right and well that the best minds should be called away? The whole country claims them: the world even, is not too wide for their fame.

Mind is above matter. Man above circumstance. Of such I am proud to see is still the pre-eminence of Maine. In the census charts which present the illiteracy of the States in grades of shadow, she stands almost as white as snow—chief I think in the whole sisterhood. I am aware that this does not mean everything. It does not mean that the highest pitch of education is here attained, but that education is broadest spread. Happy has been for her the law that the day of small things is not to be despised—that the little red

school-house may have its part too in the world's affairs, no less than the luxuries of storied halls.

It is the way we use things that makes us. But the concession is not needed. Our higher institutions have done good work. Surely without disparagement or partiality I may ask what colleges in all the country can show a brighter roll, relatively or absolutely, than the little college which Maine received as a part of her constitution. How can I select among the sons of Bowdoin—nearly every one also a son of Maine—names that shall not leave too many peers unmentioned? Hear how they begin. The Abbots, the Allens, the Andersons, the Appletons, the Cheevers, the Goodwins, the Hales, the Hamlins;—and to speak of groups by noble types, there are Stowe and Smith among scholars, Evans and Fessenden among statesmen, Sergeant Prentiss among orators, Munson and Cilley among martyrs, Andrew among patriots, Howard among heroes, Hawthorne among the masters of human speech, Longfellow among the ministers of immortal song!

I pass over the story of the war,—the noble devotion with which the State, almost as one man, stood forth for the sacred name of country; for that conservation of the Being of the People which is Supreme Law, of which institutions are the guaranty, and by which constitutions are to be interpreted; —that oneness of great life and purpose, achieving what no single members nor separate States could win, but can be wrought only in the high calling of the Nation. I pass over the names of those who, merging in that larger life all that men are wont to make the end of living, and dedicating on that high altar the costliest and dearest to each single soul, received into their own bosoms the blows that were struck at their country's. They are mustered on broader rolls, and held in holier keeping. So far as figures can tell anything, it is enough to say, that nearly 75,000 answered that high summons on land and sea, and 25,000 of the flower of our youth sleep—no, they shine, in their galaxy of graves,—from the St. Croix to the Rio Grande!

And all this toil and service and sacrifice—shall it be lost? Shall it not live, and live here, where it had its birth and belonging—though its work and burial be elsewhere? They who fell at Marathon and Thermopylæ fell for Greece for-

ever, and for freedom wherever. So they, born here, who have toiled and suffered and fallen, shall live in the life to be. For even though, as I sometimes fear, another Centennial shall not dawn upon the Republic,—if after all the toil and tears the Constitution proves inadequate to its idea, and the Union weighed down with opposing interests and disintegrated by sectional hate, breaks asunder,—man will live—freedom will live, and live here. We indeed may not; nor our sons. If we prove unworthy, into whose hands these powers and materials are given as trusts—if failing in our opportunity, and false to duty, the glory shall pass away from us,—even then, what God has made and placed here will abide; and I know some master mind will then arise, who seeing the great points of advantage and just bearing of things, and entering into the creative thought of Him who "hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation," will reconstruct these boundaries, and rearrange these forces in more effective combinations, so that neither the nations that are the workers, nor the world that is the working place, shall fail of their noble ends.

But brighter days are in store for Maine. We see even now the refluent wave. Slowly, as ignorance is dispelled and prejudice overcome, and interest appears, men are turning towards Maine. Labor and capital and mind learn that they can combine here with singular advantage. Nay, some of the primeval glory yet remains. Undeveloped forces and materials of good are still within easy reach. And old ones that were abandoned, not because they were exhausted, but because human patience and skill were wanting, will reawaken, when the new life, and the new force, take hold again on things!

The task is done. Or rather I have done. The thought I saw before me—to set Maine in her true light—is but half attained. Like all our human endeavor the end disappoints the hope,—or rather the end is never reached. I have not sought to write history. But the field is open, and as yet almost unwrought. Much history is here which never has been written. In no part of the country have different nations so long and sternly contended for the ground. In no part of the New World has early history been more tinged with romance. Scores of places along this Gulf of Maine

have beheld scenes and events which the genius of a Scott could rekindle to thrilling interest. And in the dim regions that lie beyond history, what legends and marvels float formless in the outer mist! Science may not care to inquire what sounds and voices those were which rose amidst storm and surge, as of fierce spirits battling in the upper air around the "Isle of Demons" of which Thevet tells. But echoes of sweet and sad and terrible things still haunt the lonely shore.[1] And long ago the search was ended for Norumbega, the lost city of the East—whose silver pillars and golden domes many an old traveller avers he had seen with mortal eyes,—but the legend lingers of a knightly pilgrim, who faint and dizzy with seeking, saw at last its domes and spires flashing in the glory of the setting sun, till one sense quickening another, he seems to catch the tone of chants and hymns and chapel bells, and before his very touch the crystal gates swing open, as of the heavenly Jerusalem descending from above, where death leaves him and his true life begins.[2]

But Maine has many things yet to take hold of human interests, and to stir life and love. Her thousand lakes embosomed in deep forests,—her Mount Katahdn, sombre and solitary, more wonderful in some ways even than the White Hills, with its strange craters and battlemented peaks, its wider vision of far-stretching woods in a net-work of countless silver-threaded streams and blue waters,—and this great and wide sea—this wonderful shore—these beaches and bays and harbors, and bold headlands sun-steeped in loveliness or storm-swept in grandeur;—these things invite the brave, the noble, the cultured;—those who love nature's simplicity, and are partakers of her sacraments. Thought comes here and dwells. The wearied with work come here to worship. Homes of wealth arise, and scorn not humbler ones, but give a helping hand to honest and homely toil. This will knit hearts together anew, and they will love the land, and the land will give back strength. For Mountain and River and Sea —emblems of freedom and power—are more than emblems. They hold a people to their thought, and so make them strong.

[1] Parkman (Pioneers of France, pp. 173, 203,) gives one of these wild legends from Thevet.

[2] Hakluyt, III, pp. 129, 168. Kohl, Discovery East Coast. I owe to Rev. B. F. De Costa the pleasure of reading his beautiful account of the little poem "Norumbega" in his article "The Lost City of New England": Magazine of American History, January, 1877.

And it would seem as if the day must come—for it is written in these imperishable prophecies—when in the revolutions and evolutions of history the shores of this Gulf of Maine will be the seat of industrial, social and political empire, even beyond the early dreams; for it will be an empire where no despot either of politics or traffic, shall make merchandize of souls, but where MAN, in making himself master, makes all men free!