

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

8102  
Personal



**LEGISLATIVE RECORD**

OF THE

**Seventieth Legislature**

OF THE

**STATE OF MAINE.**



**1901.**

**SENATE.**

Augusta, Feb. 22, 1901.

Senate met according to adjournment, and was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Dunnack of Augusta.

Journal read and approved.

Papers from the House disposed of in concurrence.

**READ AND ASSIGNED.**

An act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 106 of the Revised Statutes relating to draft of jurors.

An act to increase the authority of the judge of probate in Kennebec county for a certain purpose.

An act to authorize the town of Roque Bluffs to maintain a wharf.

Resolve in favor of the hospital of the Society of the Sisters of Charity of Lewiston, Me.

Resolve in favor of Young Woman's Home at Lewiston.

Resolve in favor of the Society of the Sisters of Charity for the use of the Healy Asylum of Lewiston, Me.

Resolve providing for the expenses of Company M, First Infantry, Company C, Second Infantry, and the Signal Corps, National Guard of Maine, while attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of President William McKinley in Washington, March 4, 1901.

An act relating to Sheridan plantation.

Resolve in favor of Howard Whittier for an increase in State pension.

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

An act to apportion representatives to Congress.

An act to incorporate the Poland Telephone Co.

A communication was received from the secretary of state of the state of Minnesota, in the form of a memorial to Congress, relating to a proposition for an amendment to the constitution of the United States, making United States senators elective in the several states by popular vote of the people.

On motion of Mr. White of Androscoggin, the same was referred to the committee on the judiciary.

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

**JUDICIARY.**

By Mr. Weeks of Somerset—An act to extend the charter of the Sebastcook Manufacturing and Power Co. (Under suspension of the order.)

**LEGAL AFFAIRS.**

By Mr. Rankin of York—An act to amend Section 196 of Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes as now amended relating to the sale of real estate for the non-payment of taxes.

Also an act to amend Section 196 of Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Section 6 of Chapter 70 of the Public Laws of 1895, relating to the redemption of land sold for non-payment of taxes.

Also an act to amend Section 7 of Chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes as amended by Chapter 121 of the Public Laws of 1891, relating to lists of voters.

Also an act to amend Section 198 of Chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes as now amended relating to the redemption of real estate sold for non-payment of taxes.

**INLAND FISHERIES AND GAME.**

By Mr. of Oxford—An act to prohibit the taxing of smelts from Mill brook, so called, in the town of Lovell, Oxford county. (Under suspension of the order.)

**EDUCATION.**

By Mr. of Somerset, Petition of C. O. Small and 75 others of Madison in favor of an act relating to superintendents of schools in cities and towns.

Also petition of F. W. C. Wiggin and 212 others in favor of same.

**PENOBSCOT COUNTY DELEGATION.**

By Mr. Plummer of Penobscot—Remonstrance of J. D. Scott and 51 others, citizens of Winn, against the Bangor and Brewer bridge bill.

Also remonstrance of R. C. Noyes of Bradford and 24 others against same.

Also remonstrance of G. W. Brown of Alton and 19 others against same.

Also remonstrance of D. S. Humphrey and 21 others, citizens of Charleston, against same.

Also remonstrance of E. A. Pierce and 25 others, citizens of Hudson, against same.

Also remonstrance of B. F. Clark and 10 others, citizens of Kenduskeag, against same.

Also remonstrance of J. J. Reeves and 18 others, citizens of Bradford, against same.

Also remonstrance of James Edes and nine others, citizens of Burlington, against same.

Also remonstrance of J. W. Burke and 35 others, citizens of Lee, against same.

Also remonstrance of A. F. Averill and 25 others, citizens of Veazie, against same.

Also remonstrance of J. F. Gould and 199 others, citizens of Old Town, against same.

By Mr. Jones of Penobscot—Remonstrance of Melvin Leslie and 47 others of Patten against same.

Also remonstrance of W. S. Smith and 43 others of Kingman, against same.

Also remonstrance of W. L. Scribner and 17 others of Springfield against same.

By Mr. Adams of Penobscot, remonstrance of J. A. Peters and 90 others of Bangor, against same.

Also remonstrance of Edward Smart and 27 others of Greenbush, against same.

Also remonstrance of Samuel Libby of Orono and 18 others against same.

By Mr. Stearns of Oxford—An act relating to fraternal beneficiary organizations, and moved its reference to the committee on mercantile affairs and insurance.

On motion of Mr. Bryant of Somerset this bill was laid on the table to be printed pending its reference to the committee.

#### ORDERS.

By Mr. Noble of Franklin—Ordered, the House concurring, that when the House and Senate adjourn it be until Monday, Feb. 25, at 4.30 P. M.

The Senate was subsequently informed of the concurrence of the House in the foregoing order.

Mr. STAPLES of Knox: Mr. President, I put in an order the other day for the Insane Asylum to furnish for

the information of the Senate an account of the expenditures from 1890 to 1900; and I see by the report that the information desired by amendment A can only be furnished by the treasurer of the Insane Asylum; and I therefore introduce this order: Ordered, that the treasurer of the Insane Hospital be ordered to furnish for the information of the Senate an itemized account of all expenditures of this department from 1892 to 1900 inclusive.

Mr. WEEKS of Somerset: I wish to ask the senator if that information cannot be obtained from the Governor and Council. My impression is that the warrants are drawn for all expenditures at the Insane Hospital upon a bill of items filed by the treasurer of the hospital with the Governor and Council. I do not know what the correct method for getting this information is. I have no objection, however, to the senator's order this morning, if it is correct. Of course we can go over the ground again. We have been over it partially once.

Mr. STAPLES of Knox—The report of the State treasurer which you will find in Senate bill No. 51, says that the information desired by amendment A which is the information that I desire, can only be furnished by the treasurer of the Insane Hospital. That is why I put in this order. I do not care how the information comes to the Senate—whether from the Governor and Council, or from the treasurer; but I take it from the report of the State treasurer that this is the only way it can be furnished. That is why I introduce the order.

Mr. VICKERY of Kennebec: I would like to ask the senator from Knox if he wants an itemized account. If he does, he will want an appropriation to go with it. You cannot get it itemized by the people who work on those books for two months; but the trustees are perfectly willing to do it; and it will take a very long time to go over \$200,000 in items. I have been over it with them. We would like to do it, and will do it if required, but we shall have to have an appropriation with which to do it.

Mr. WEEKS of Somerset: I desire to say right here that the senator from

Knox can obtain all this information out of the office of the secretary of State. I am informed that the bill of items presented to the Governor and Council upon which the warrants are drawn against the Insane Hospital appropriation is filed with the secretary of State; and those items, of course, may be examined by anyone. Now, it seems that the senator has not got really the correct source of information; and I therefore move that this order lie upon the table until after I can confer with the senator from Knox and until after he gets and we all get further enlightenment upon the subject; and I will say that I will take it up next Tuesday.

Mr. STAPLES of Knox: That is satisfactory.

By Mr. Stearns of Oxford, it was ordered that 100 additional copies of bill, an act relating to fraternal beneficiary organizations be printed for the use of the insurance department.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. Burleigh, for the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition of A. F. Moody and others to open certain ponds in Stoneham to ice fishing, reported petitioners have leave to withdraw.

Mr. Viciery, for the committee on inland fisheries and game, on bill, an act to regulate fishing in Moosehad lake and its tributaries, reported same ought not to pass.

Mr. Vickery, for the committee on inland fisheries and game, on petition of George Hazen and 6 others, for a law to prevent fishing through the ice in part of Tompson's pond in Oxford county, reported that the same be referred to the commissioners of inland fisheries and game, as the subject matter of the petition properly comes under their jurisdiction by the general law.

Also on bill, an act to prevent fishing in a part of Thompson's pond in Oxford county, that the same be referred to the commissioners of inland fisheries and game as the subject matter properly comes under their jurisdiction by the general law.

Mr. Vickery, for the committee on inland fisheries and game, on bill, an

act to prohibit fishing in Pleasant pond and its inlets, situated in Sumner, Oxford county, with petition of E. M. Andrews and 30 others for same, reported same ought to pass. Bill laid on the table to be printed under the joint rules.

Mr. Noble, for the committee on legal affairs, on resolve in favor of George C. Ryan, reported that same ought not to pass.

Mr. Staples, for the committee on legal affairs, on bill, an act relating to the Mallison Power Company, reported same in new draft under same title and that it ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Jones, for the committee on interior waters, on bill, an act to incorporate the Sandy Stream Dam and Improvement Company, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Jones, for the committee on interior waters, on bill, an act to extend the charter of Winn Water and Power Company, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Jones, for the committee on interior waters on resolve in aid of navigation on Moosehead lake, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. White for the committee on the judiciary on bill, an act to authorize telephone, telegraph, electric light, heat or power companies to place their wires under the surface of public ways, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Macfarlane, for the committee on interior waters, on bill, an act to amend Chapter 419 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, as amended by Chapter 155 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899, relating to the Penobscot East Branch Log Driving Company, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

The same senator, for the same committee, on bill, an act to authorize John P. Yerxa, Edgar Perry, Arthur Gilpatrick, and Selden R. Tacy to construct and maintain a dam across the Little Madawaska river in Aroostook county and build and maintain piers in

said river, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Plummer, for the committee on legal affairs, on bill, an act to amend Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 85 of the Public Laws of 1895, relative to the settlement of titles to real estate, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

The same senator for the same committee on bill, an act to incorporate the Brudgton Water Company, reported same ought to pass. Tabled for printing under the joint rules.

**PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED.**

Resolve in aid of navigation on Sebec lake.

An act additional to Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes in relation to railroads.

An act to amend Chapter 204 of the Public Laws of 1856, in relation to the municipal court of the city of Portland.

An act in relation to disorderly conduct and evasion of fares on street railroads, steamboats and ferries.

An act additional to Chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes, relating to insurance.

An act to extend the charter of the Mutual Fire Insurance Company.

An act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 96 of the Private and Special Laws of 1899, and to authorize the Van Buren Water Company to increase the amount of its mortgage bonds.

Resolve in favor of Allagash road.

Resolve in favor of repairing the road between Patten and Grand lake.

Resolve in favor of road in Perkins' plantation.

An act to prohibit winter fishing in Great Watchie pond, and regulating the time for fishing in the tributaries of the same.

An act authorizing and empowering the Great Northern Paper Company to erect and maintain piers and booms in the West Branch of the Penobscot river.

An act to prohibit bate fishing, so called, in Seven ponds, Seven Ponds stream, Little Kennebago lake and the outlet of the same to the dam at the head of Kennebago Falls, and the outlet of Kennebago lake.

An act in relation to the taxation of street railroad companies.

An act in relation to the compensation of the sheriff of the county of Oxford, establishing a salary.

An act to amend Chapter 172 of the Private and Special Laws of 1891, relating to the consolidation of certain railroad companies.

Mr. NOBLE of Franklin: I find, in this bill there has been a clerical error made; and I wish to introduce this amendment to same, House Document 167, Amend by adding the words "Section 1" at the beginning of the line 9 and by striking out the words "or their successors" in the 13th and 14th line and inserting in the 12th line after the word "companoes," before the word "are" the words "or their successors"; also amend Section 2 by adding at the beginning of line 6, the words "Section 2."

The motion to amend prevailed, and the bill, as amended passed to be engrossed.

Bill, an act to prevent the throwing of sawdust and other refuse stuff into the waters of McGraw, Ellis, East, North, Great, Long, Little or Snow ponds or either of their tributaries situated partly in Knnebec and partly in Somerset counties.

On motion by Mr. Weeks of Somerset, this bill was laid on the table until next Tuesday, pending its second reading.

**PASSED TO BE ENACTED.**

An act to set off Calf island and West Black island from the plantation of Long island in the county of Hancock, and annex the same to the town of Swan's island.

**FINALLY PASSED.**

Resolve in favor of O. B. Clason of Gardiner, Maine.

Resolve in favor of the town of Waterboro.

Resolve authorizing the compilation of the sea and shore fisheries laws of the State of Maine.

Resolve in favor of the Eastern Maine General Hospital.

Resolve in favor of the St. Elizabeth's Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum of Portland.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY.

On motion by Mr. Adams of Penobscot, House Document 104, resolve in air of navigation on Sebec lake was taken from the table, and on the further motion of that Senator, it took its second reading and was passed to be engrossed.

An act to amend Chapter 208 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, entitled an act to enable the proprietors of the Bangor bridge to dispose of their bridge property.

On motion of Mr. Plummer of Penobscot, this bill was taken from the table, it having been tabled on his motion pending the acceptance of the report of the committee, and being specially assigned for today.

Mr. PLUMMER of Penobscot: Mr. President, in the first place I wish briefly to explain how this Bangor & Brewer bridge bill came before the Legislature.

When the senators and representatives from the county were nominated and elected, the proposition to have the county of Penobscot pay half, or any other part, of the cost of purchasing the bridge had not been put forth nor had that feature of the matter been in any way disclosed or discussed. Nobody outside the few sponsors and projectors of the scheme knew it had been incubated, and would appear before the coming Legislature. Hence no senator or representative was nominated or elected with reference to his views upon that proposition, for the very good reason that the people who nominated and elected them did not know anything about it. In the required Legislative notice published a few weeks before the meeting of the Legislature there was nothing to warn the people of the county that they would be asked to pay any part of the purchase price of the bridge.

After the Legislature had been some time in session, a bill similar to the one before us was presented to the several members of the county delegation individually and privately, and upon one special plea and another, and as a personal favor to certain interested parties, the assent of nearly all of them secured thereto.

After this preliminary work had been done a meeting of the delegation was called, and without any hearing having been advertised or notice given the people of the county to appear and make known their views and wishes on the question, an affirmative vote of all the members of the delegation except two was secured, to report favorably to the Legislature the bill before us. The original bill presented to the members in the preliminary canvass contained a clause making the bridge and its approaches a county way, to be supported by the county after its purchase, which of course would have involved its renewal when necessary at the expense of the county. This clause, however, being strenuously opposed by myself, was stricken out before the bill was submitted to the assembled delegation.

The original bill also required the county commissioners to borrow money to pay one-half the purchase price of the bridge without limit, whatever it might be, but in the delegation meeting, after discussion and opposition from the sponsors of the bill, the limit of \$12,000 for the share to be paid by the county was, upon my motion, put in the bill.

I also moved in the delegation meeting that the question whether the county commissioners should issue the bonds of the county for the \$12,000 to be paid towards the purchase price of the bridge, be submitted to the legal voters of the county for their approval or disapproval, but only three of the delegation voted in favor of the motion. Hence the bill is before us in its present objectionable form.

Now I believe toll bridges belong to the era of the stage coach and like the stage coach should go. I believe the one connecting the cities of Bangor and Brewer should at the earliest day practicable be made free. But I believe the expense of making it free should be borne by the two cities, which are abundantly able to bear it.

The authority to purchase the bridge was given the two cities by the Legislature of 1895, but they have up to this time failed to take any step under it, and have come to the Legislature of 1901 with another proposition which is the modest one of asking the Legis-

lature to make the county of Penobscot pay half the purchase price and borrow the money for the purpose.

The question now before us is, ought the county of Penobscot be forced by legislative enactment to borrow money to the amount of \$12,000 for such purpose, without any opportunity being afforded the people of the county, who will have to pay, to say whether or not they are willing to do it?

In my conscience I do not believe the Legislature ought to do any such thing, and in my conscience I do not believe Bangor and Brewer ought to ask any such thing. No such proposition was before the people when their senators and representatives were nominated and elected, and they were not chosen with reference to their attitude upon it. Hence their recommendation in its favor counts for less than it would if the contrary were the fact, and this Legislature should not, in my opinion, be governed by it when it contravenes every sound principle of popular government, public policy and equitable distribution of civic burdens.

In my opinion the resources of the county should be reserved for and given to the weak and poor communities and not to the strong and rich. This is the sound and just principle under which the contributions from counties to municipalities have heretofore been made. In sparsely settled and financially weak and poor communities, where large bridges were imperatively required for the use and convenience of the public, the cost of which was beyond the ability of such communities to provide, counties have, through their commissioners, applied money which they already had on hand, in rare instances and to a moderate extent, to the construction or renewal of such bridges, but never before, so far as I know, has Penobscot or any other county been forced by legislative authority to borrow money without ratification by the people to aid in the purchase, construction or renewal of a bridge in one of the greatest centres of population and wealth in the State.

Why, Mr. President, Bangor and Brewer, with a valuation of \$17,503,908, are the richest community in the State save two, and what equity is there in

forcing by legislative enactment, the 55 towns and several plantations in Penobscot county, whose total wealth of \$16,672,737 is all told \$831,071 less than that of the two cities, and which have to support all their own bridges, not only to continue to do so, but to pay a large percentage toward making free to public travel this bridge between these two rich and thriving cities?

Only five small towns, Clifton, Edgington, Bradley, Holden and Orrington, with a total valuation of \$933,004, and population of 3449, are so situated that their citizens have to cross the bridge when going to Bangor, the imperial city of Penobscot county, to which all roads lead, and in which all roads end, and the citizens of the 50 other towns and several plantations, with a valuation of \$15,739,733, upon which will devolve the payment of 94 per cent. of the county's share under this bill, never use the bridge for business travel, and very rarely indeed for pleasure travel.

Now I submit that it is not just and equitable to force the citizens of the five small and financially weak towns, even, which have to use the bridge when they go to market, to help support it, inasmuch as they themselves have to support without outside aid all roads and bridges within the borders of said towns, which the citizens of Bangor and Brewer and all other travelers use freely whenever they have occasion.

If this be so, how manifestly and monstrously unjust and inequitable it is to compel by legislative enactment the citizens of the 50 towns and several plantations who do not use the bridge for business travel at all, and only on rare occasions, and to a very limited extent for pleasure travel, and who maintain their own bridges free and safe for citizens of Bangor and Brewer and all other comers and goers, to make the contribution contemplated and required by this bill.

Mr. President, the purchase of this bridge for \$24,000 would be only a trivial burden for the rich and populous community in which it exists. It would be no more for the two cities in proportion to their financial ability



than it would for Dexter to raise \$1640, Exeter \$460, Hampden \$960, Lincoln \$670, Old Town \$2290, Plymouth \$244, Springfield \$160, Hudson \$150, Patten \$600, Hermon \$500, LaGrange \$260, Veazie \$360, Orono \$1420, Alton \$85, Argyle \$100, Bradford \$340, Bradley \$201, Burlington \$180, Carmel \$400, Carroll \$153, Charleston \$400, Chester \$93, Corinna \$624, Corinth \$571, Dixmont \$354, Edenburg \$36, Enfield \$355, Etna \$182, Garland \$463, Glenburn \$192, Greenbush \$120, Greenfield \$60, Howland \$418, Kenduskeag \$224, Kingham \$222, Lee \$175, Levant \$352, Lowell \$116, Mattamiscontis \$26, Mattawamkeag \$175, Maxfield \$33, Milford \$420, Medway \$137, Mt. Chase \$77, Newberg \$360, Newport \$784, Passadumkeag \$60, Prentiss \$103, Stetson \$298, Winn \$234, Woodville \$65, Orrington \$567, Holden \$208, Eddington \$222, Clifton \$89. Now what one of these towns would dream of seeking county aid or any outside aid to meet such an expenditure? Not one of them would hesitate to provide for it themselves. Old Town and Orono have both made toll-bridges free in their midst at their own expense, and so would Bangor and Brewer, in my opinion, if this were all there is to the proposition.

But it is not all. There are two things, now thinly veiled, but sure in due time to come to light, which will make this project mean vastly more to the county than this \$12,000. Merely, if the wrongful principle and dangerous precedent is established by this Legislature of granting the county commissioners authority to place an interest-bearing bonded debt on the county in the way proposed in this bill, without submitting the matter to the legal voters of the county.

First: The probable fixing of the value of the old bridge at a sum much larger than \$24,000. Indeed I understand the assessed value of the old bridge is twice that figure, and it is not reasonable to suppose the stockholders will permit it to be scaled down one-half without a strenuous contest.

Second: The early necessity and demand for the renewal of the bridge by a costly steel one, suitable for electric car service, etc.

These are the propositions concerning this bridge which will confront the two cities, and the county too, if this Legislature forces it into partnership with the two cities in the purchase of this bridge. True this bill does not reveal such propositions and purposes, and if it specifically renounced them, it would make no difference. One Legislature cannot bind another, and does any gentleman from the country towns of Penobscot county, or any senator in this body, for one moment doubt that when it shall have been ascertained that more than \$12,000 is required to pay half the price of the old bridge, and decided that a new steel one is required, Bangor and Brewer will appeal to another Legislature to compel the county to pay the excess above \$12,000 of one half the purchase price of the bridge, and also one-half the cost of the new steel structure, and base their strongest argument on the fact that by the action of the Legislature of 1901, the county was made to pay one-half the purchase price of the old structure, then underestimated at \$12,000, and thus became a partner in the enterprise, and morally bound to pay a full half of the cost of the old bridge, and to contribute in like degree towards its renewal?

Does anyone doubt that with the increased representation which the two cities will probably have under the new apportionment, at the expense of the country districts, and the well known strength of their influence throughout the county, they will succeed, if we give them the benefit of the precedent which the passage of this bill will establish? Does anybody doubt that the county will be in for not only the \$12,000 which this bill carries, but in the end for not less than \$60,000? Oo you think, senators, such an outcome will be right, and just to the citizens of the 50 towns not directly benefited? Do you think they will rise up and call us blessed if we take this first step in placing such an inequitable burden upon them?

No, Mr. President, this proposition is wrong in principle and wrong as a precedent. I have tried to bring myself into accord with the majority of my county delegation in this matter,

but I confess I cannot do it. I confess I cannot see any semblance of justice and equity in forcing by legislative enactment the town of Dexter to contribute the \$410 required for her part of the \$12,000 even, towards this bridge, when she has to support her own bridges without outside aid, nor Exeter \$117, nor Hampden \$240, nor Lincoln \$167, nor Old Town \$572, nor Plymouth \$61, nor Patten \$150, nor Hermon \$125, nor LeGrange \$65, nor Orono \$355, nor Corinth \$143, and so on with the other towns in proportion to their valuation, with the probability that they will have to pay five times these amounts before they see the end of the bridge matter. I think the county should help, if any, the weak and poor municipalities and not the strongest and richest, and even such help, if it necessitates the borrowing of money on the part of the county, should not be compelled by the Legislature, until opportunity has been given the taxpayers and legal voters to pass upon the question and ratify or refuse to ratify the loan.

Upon this principle I stand, and although only one or two other members of my county delegation stand with me, I believe I am right, and so believing I cannot yield my position without making this defence. It is not pleasant to have to differ from one's friends and associates. It is a real regret for me to do so. How much easier it is to float with the tide than to try to stem it; to fall in with our friends' plans, schemes and purposes, rather than to refuse them. But much as I would cherish the approbation of friends, I cherish the approbation of my conscience more. In any event I shall have the consciousness that I have done the right thing, as I have been able to see what was right, and stood for justice and equity for all the municipalities and citizens of my county, especially for those whom I the more immediately represent, and who, hence, have the best right to expect me to be watchful and careful of their rights and interests.

Mr. President, this proposition to authorize and empower the county commissioners of Penobscot county to issue the bonds of the county for \$12,000, without a vote of the legal voters of the county, upon the question, is to be followed by a proposition to authorize and empower them to issue county bonds to the amount of \$125,000 without submitting the question to the legal voters of the county, for the purpose of building a new court house.

Now the main feature of this last proposition is not in itself wrong and unjust as is the proposition in regard to the bridge, inasmuch as a new court house

is needed and will be the property of the county, and the whole county ought to pay for it when built; but I submit it is not right, just, safe, nor good and sound business policy even, looking to the favorable marketing of the bonds, to have \$137,000 worth of them at their face value, issued and put upon the market without the approval of the proposition by the legal voters of the county. Hence, for the reasons I have tried to set forth in the course of this speech, and further, in order that the action of the Legislature, in not requiring the approval of the issue of the bridge bonds by the legal voters of the county, may not be made a precedent in the case of the court house bonds, and in view of the fact that while this bill has lain upon the table a large number of remonstrances against it have been sent in from the county of Penobscot, I move the following amendment:

"Sec. 6. No notes and obligations of the county shall be issued, as hereinbefore provided, until the question shall have been submitted to the legal voters of the county, and a majority of those voting thereon, shall have voted in favor of such issue."

THE PRESIDENT: The senator offers this amendment, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. PLUMMER of Penobscot: Mr. President, pending the question of the passage of the amendment, I move it lie upon the table to be printed, and that this whole matter be reassigned for Wednesday of next week.

The question being put upon the acceptance of the report of the Penobscot delegation in concurrence with the House, the same was declared to be accepted in concurrence.

The motion of Mr. Plummer to amend, prevailed.

Mr. WEEKS of Somerset: I do not know as I care to discuss this question, this morning. I am sorry, and I desire to express my profound sorrow here, to see the bubbling disturbance in the Holy Waters of the Penobscot. This is a matter, of course, which relates entirely to the Penobscot county delegates. It is something in which they alone, perhaps, are interested; and yet, I suppose we all have our opinions as to toll bridges. Now, the senator from Penobscot, who has fired his heavy shot, this morning, has limbered up his artillery, gracefully retires, and notifies the Senate that he will fight this out, next Wednesday. Well, if the senators from Penobscot have agreed upon that matter, of course the Senate feels very much gratified. We certainly have good reason to respect, and do admire the Penobscot county delegation. For 10 years they have stood united upon every matter of public importance. For 10 years they have stood shoulder to shoulder, fighting for the largest appropriations and the longest time. They have accomplished their object almost every time.

I remember, as a matter of personal experience, I, myself, have been almost

literally taken down, rolled in the dust and bowled over by the Penobscot county delegation; and I want to say this—that I have no spirit of resentment. I am willing, if I can, with my strong prejudices against toll bridges, to consider this matter fairly, honestly and squarely.

The sweet poet of the Penobscot, who is now dead, once wrote a poem—David Barker once wrote a poem, which William Cullen Bryant pronounced to be the best short poem in the English language. I have forgotten the title of it, but it likened Death and the tomb to a covered bridge. It must have been a toll bridge, because the sweet poet said the toll gathered by Death was the body which the hand of God had flung about the soul. I never knew where David Barker received the inspiration of that poem until this very morning. (Laughter.) It seems that the inspiration of that poem came from the Bangor toll bridge—likening Death and the tomb to a toll bridge.

Mr. President, we will consider this matter carefully, considerately and honestly. We are outsiders. We have, up in the county of Somerset, some three toll bridges. I am now confessing my sins—the sins of my county. The very waters in the beautiful Kennebec river are ashamed when they approach a toll bridge, and they gather and shoot by as quickly as possible; but they splurge and splash and splutter below at these mockeries of the Spirit of Progress of the 20th century. Why! When a man dies up in my region, sometimes the only consolation that his friends have is that the dear departed one has taken wings, and can fly across the river, instead of having to go on a toll bridge. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. President, I do not wish to counteract the oratorical effort of the senator from Penobscot—I certainly am not equal to the occasion; but I do want to point out this fact that I desire to submit for the consideration of the Senate, and for its careful consideration—that is, that in no event—in no event can the county of Penobscot pay the sum of over \$12,000. This brings us to this point in the case—and I will be brief—I do not desire to trench upon the time of the Senate. The city of Bangor and the city of Brewer pay one-half of all the taxes assessed in the county of Penobscot. That leaves, in any event, only the sum of \$6000 to be raised by the outside towns. That I simply state as a matter of fact and as a matter of figures. I cannot go over all the details of those figures as the senator from Penobscot has, giving the towns of the county and the amount of tax that they would have to pay. I suppose that this money cannot be raised by voluntary contribution; and yet, if they should pass round the hat, with my limited means, I would give all I possibly could, considering the condition. Here is another fact which I desire to state here, this morning. This bill provides, and I hope every senator will read it before next Wednesday—this bill provides absolutely—if I can

read the English language and understand it—absolutely that the two cities shall support and maintain and build any new bridge; and it shall be forever free, after the purchase. With this statement, Mr. President, I leave the matter open to be discussed, next Wednesday; and I hope at that time I may be able to give my views generally upon the matter of toll bridges.

On motion by Mr. Adams of Penobscot, resolve in aid of navigation of Sebec lake was taken from the table, read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Staples of Knox, bill, an act to provide in part for expenditures of government, was specially assigned for next Thursday, the same having been previously tabled upon the motion of that senator, pending the acceptance of the report of the committee.

On motion by Mr. Staples of Knox,  
Adjourned.