

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

Legislative Record

OF THE

Seventy-Fifth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1911

HOUSE.

Prayer by Rev. Mr. Steele of Hallowell.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

Bill, An Act to authorize the erection of a dam across the East Branch of Spruce Creek in the town of Kittery, which was referred in the House to the committee on legal affairs, came from the Senate referred in that branch to the committee on interior waters.

On motion of Mr. Mitchell of Kittery the House receded and concurred with the Senate in its reference.

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

Judiciary.

By Mr. Goodwin of Biddeford: An Act to amend Chapter 243 of the Public Laws of 1909 relating to the choice of assessors in towns.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Sleeper of South Berwick: An Act establishing the Yorkshire municipal court.

Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

By Mr. Percy of Bath: Resolve in favor of the Bath City hospital.

By Mr. Ross of Bangor: Resolve in favor of the Good Samaritan Home Association of Bangor.

Ways and Bridges.

By Mr. Chase of York: Resolve in favor of the York hospital.

By Mr. Chase of York: An Act to authorize the town of York to construct a way across the tide waters of Barrel's mill pond, so-called, in York harbor.

Also petition of Roscoe Grant and 21 others in favor of the construction of way across the tidewater in York harbor.

Also petition of John H. Varrell and 18 others in favor of the construction of way across tidewater in York harbor.

Agriculture.

By Mr. Dow of Plymouth: Resolve in favor of the New England Fruit show.

Towns.

By Mr. Hodgkins of Damariscotta: An Act to divide the town of Bristol and incorporate the town of South Bristol.

Claims.

By Mr. Patten of Hermon: Resolve in favor of the town of Hermon.

Orders.

Mr. Goodwin of Biddeford presented the following order:

Ordered, The Senate concurring, that the committee on public buildings and grounds cause to be made an inventory of the stock of fountain pens, scissors, nail files, penknives, manicure sets, curling irons and other articles for the use of statesmen, said to have been left over from the last administration, and, after due notice to all concerned, dispose of the same at public sale and thermometers, brass cuspidors and waste baskets, to replace the like articles which are said to have mysteriously disappeared from the committee rooms and other places in the State House at about the time of final adjournment of the 74th Legislature.

On motion of Mr. Davies the order was tabled for printing.

Resolves on Their Final Passage.

Resolve authorizing a temporary loan for the year 1911.

The SPEAKER: This is the resolve which was considered by this House yesterday. It is now on its final passage. On that it is necessary that a ye and nay vote be taken. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA—Allen of Columbia Falls, Allen of Jonesboro, Ames, Anderson, Austin, Averill, Bearce, Benn, Berry, Bi bee, Bogue Boman, Bowker, Briggs, Burkett, Buzzell, Camp'el, Chase, Cl rk, Clearwater, Colby, Connors, Cop land, Couture, Cowan, Cronin, Cyr, Davies, Davis, Deering of Portland, Deering of Waldoboro, Descoteaux, Dow, Doyle, Dresser, Drummond, Dufour, Dunn, Dutton, Emerson, Emery, Farham, Fenderson, Files, Frank, Gamache, Greenwood, Gross, Hartwell, Hastings, H ffron, Hersey, Hodgkins of Damariscotta, H d gkins of Lamoine, Hodgman, Hogan, Johnson, Jordan, Ke'ev, Kelliher, Kennard, Kingsbury, Knight, Lambert, Lawry, LeBel, L bby, Littlefield, Mace, Mac mfer, Mc'lett, Manter, Marriner, McAllister, McBride, McCann, McCrady, McCur-

dy, Merrifield, Merrill, Miller of Hartland, Miller of Palmyra, Mitchell, Morse of Belfast, Morse of Waterville, Mower, Murphy, Newcomb, Noyes, Packard, Pattangall, Patten, Peledr, Percy, Perkins of Kennebunk, Perkins of Mechanic Falls, Peters, Phillips, Pike, Pinkham, Plummer, Pollard, Porter of Pembroke, Porter of Mapleton, Powers, Putnam, Robinson of Lagrange, Robinson of Peru, Ross, Russell, Sawyer, Scates, Shea, Skehan, Sleeper, Small, Smith, Active I. Snow, Alvah Snow, Snow of Bucksport, Soule, Setson, Stinson, Strickland, Thompson of Presque Isle, Thompson of Skowhegan, Trafton, Trim, Trimble, Tucker, Waldron, Weston, Weymouth, Wheeler, Whitney, Wilcox, Wilkins, William on, Wilson, Woodside—141.

ABSENT—Andrews, Brown, Goodwin, Harmon, Hedman, Monroe, Quimby, Trask, Turner—9.

Two-thirds of all the members elected to the House having voted in the affirmative, the resolve was finally passed.

A communication was received from the Senate through its secretary proposing a joint convention of the two branches of the Legislature forthwith in Representatives' hall for the purpose of electing an attorney general.

The House concurred in the proposition and the clerk was charged with and conveyed a message to the Senate to that effect.

Thereupon the Senate came in and a convention was formed.

In Convention.

On motion of Senator Boynton, Messrs. Boynton of Lincoln, Milliken of Aroostook, Ross of Bangor, Bearce of Eddington and Hogan of Portland, were appointed a committee to receive, sort and count votes for attorney general.

Having attended to the duty assigned it, Senator Boynton from the committee reported as follows:

Whole number of votes, 167; Cyrus R. Tupper had 102; W. C. Philbrook had 63; W. R. Pattangall had 2.

The report was accepted, and Hon. Cyrus R. Tupper was declared duly elected attorney general.

On motion of Senator Allen of Washington the secretary of the Senate was charged with and conveyed a message to the Governor informing him of the election of Hon. Cyrus R. Tupper as attorney general.

The purpose for which the conven-

tion was formed having been accomplished, it was dissolved and the Senate retired.

IN THE HOUSE.

Orders of the Day.

On motion of Mr. Davies of Yarmouth the following order was taken from the table:

Ordered, That no bill or resolve carrying an appropriation of money shall be finally passed prior to the first day of March.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House will not see fit to pass this order. I am not unmindful of the fact that it is presented by the leader of the majority in the House, and I am also mindful of the fact of the rights and privileges which belong to the majority in parliamentary bodies. It must be borne in mind, however, that no political principle is at stake here. Any Republican who votes to defeat the passage of the order cannot be accused of trying to bankrupt the treasury, and any Democrat who votes for the passage of the order cannot be accused, in my opinion, of disloyalty. The question that is presented to us here is only a question of procedure, whether we shall leave at a certain place before final enactment all the appropriations that are made by this Legislature, or whether each one shall be brought forward in its turn and passed upon its merits. I think there is a good deal to be said in favor of passing each resolution carrying an appropriation as it comes into the House, upon its merits.

In the Legislature of 1909 a system was inaugurated, under the direction of Mr. Burleigh of Augusta, which provided for a schedule of appropriations and expenditures, and that statement of appropriations and expenditures was made up from day to day, or at least once a week. I am not sure which, and was left on each member's desk, and by referring to the schedule or statement of appropriations that was gotten out under the direction of the clerk of the House, every member in the House could see from day to day just what the Legislature had done in

the way of appropriating money. Is there any better system than that? Is there any better way by which a member of the House can have entire knowledge of the appropriations that are made from day to day than he can have through consulting the statements of just what has been done left on his desk each morning, or at least once a week?

One of my objections to the order which is now pending is that towards the end of the session it is going to bring a great deal of business into the Legislature to be acted upon which we cannot intelligently and carefully take care of. Those who are old members well know that in the last two or three weeks of the Legislature we are flooded with bills from all the committees. It is actually impossible at times to read the acts even by title only, to say nothing about giving them the consideration which they demand and which they should receive. But there is another objection which presents itself to my mind—and, mind you, I criticise no man's good faith whether on the part of the majority party or that of the minority—but such a condition as this would present itself when all the resolves carrying money come in here at one time. The appropriation matter in the Legislature is the all-important matter. Those of you who are here and who want appropriations for schools and for roads and for various other things which are local and are not general, if they have been granted in the past and if they were proper and economical, expect to receive them at this session, and local matters will have paramount consideration to a great many of you. Providing that the facts shall so shape themselves that some of those who are most prominent in the Legislature will want some large measure to pass—and there will be such in the Legislature—wouldn't the effect of this order be that the power given to those people under the order could be used as a weapon to club the man into line who wants an appropriation for some local institution or some local improvement? I believe that the members of this House can be trusted to work out the matter of appropriations from day to

day. I believe they can be passed on their merits. It is not as though we had a certain amount of money that we were to pass and no more, in appropriations. Whatever the State needs the State is able to pay for, and the State is just as well able to appropriate the money today as it will be on the first of March or any day subsequent to that time. And that is the condition that we are confronted with.

My friends, it seems to me that the majority party have inaugurated in this House a policy of what might be called hot-house economy. Maine is able to take care of her needs. She needs no encumbrance from me. The world knows her history by heart; and we can appropriate for schools or we can appropriate for hospitals or we can appropriate for educational purposes anything that we need, and can pay it irrespective of what any Democrat may say, just as soon as the Legislature thinks it is necessary.

Mr. PETERS of Ellsworth: Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that the proposition of the gentleman from Waterville is good business judgment. I see, as my friend from Yarmouth says, no politics whatever in this proposition. It should be approached, of course, from the standpoint of a business man. It seems to me, however, instead of being a matter of procedure, in the final analysis it comes down to be more a matter of policy. It is perfectly clear that we are to be flooded, as the Legislature is almost always flooded, by requests for a large number of appropriations for private and semi-public institutions throughout the State, all more or less deserving, all deserving probably. Now if, as heretofore, we are likely to grant the principal demands or requests of these institutions, these hospitals, institutes, schools, bridges and so forth, why, then, I agree with the gentleman from Yarmouth that there is no necessity for changing the procedure; but if the members think, as I do, that those appropriations of that class have anyhow either got to be cut out entirely or have got to be seriously reduced, then it seems to me a matter of good judgment to have all these requests

lined up before us, as this order would result in doing, so their merits can be discussed and so they may all be treated fairly. It won't do to pass the appropriation for instance which the gentleman from Augusta has already asked for, for aid for his hospital here, and then find that our money is giving out and that we cannot afford in the present condition of the finances to do the same thing for others. It won't do to treat one man generously or one institution liberally and another one niggardly; we have got to treat them all alike.

Now it seems to me from what I have observed and known of the financial condition of the State that it was necessary for us to retrench, and I see no better place to do so than by cutting off these gratuities, at least to a large extent; and if we are to adopt that policy of cutting them off, I see no other way to get at it than to have them lined up and see what their claims are, what their needs are, in order to adjust their rights equitably before this tribunal; and if I continue to favor as I do a serious cutting out, if not an entire cutting out, of these gratuities, it strikes me that there is nothing for us to do but to postpone consideration or final passage of that sort of thing until a day certain, so we can adjust and know the rights and proper demands of all these institutions; and for that reason I personally favor the proposition of the gentleman from Waterville that this order have a passage and that this class of legislation be finally postponed until after the first of March.

Mr. HERSEY of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I consider that there are many serious objections to the passage of this order. I want to mention one or two. In the first place, the gentleman from Waterville offering the order says that it shall apply to this House only. It is not a joint order of both Houses; it is an order of this House only. The Senate proceeds with its legislation in the ordinary way with the passage of its bills and its resolves. We take a different course, almost a revolutionary course, in business. To be sure, acts and resolves calling for the appropriation of money

come into this House the same as any other bills or resolves. They are read by their title, they are referred to the appropriate committees of the Legislature, notice is given, public hearings are had and everybody is heard for or against the measure in committee. Then the committees make their report for or against the measure to the House and to the Senate. Discussions are had, we consider the matter in the light of the evidence of the committee, in the light of the public hearings, in the light of the discussions on the floor of the House and Senate, and after a full discussion, when the matter is fresh in our minds and everybody has the privilege of voting and is present, it seems to me that that is the time to pass or reject the matter. Then it is that the bill or the resolve must stand or fall upon its own merits. It is not antagonized, not prejudiced, by any other matter, by any other bill or resolve before the House; it does not depend on some other measure to pass it or any other alliance. But this order says that when you arrive at that point, when the bill is to be put upon its final passage, before a final vote is taken, you, Mr. Speaker, by virtue of this order must necessarily lay these bills and resolves upon the table until after the first of March. It seems to me that such a proceeding as that on the part of the House only, not a joint order, will confuse the business of this Legislature, to start with; and that is one of its most serious objections.

The gentleman from Waterville in introducing this order, in explaining it, says—and I read the record—"The purpose of that order would be to assemble all appropriations and resolves before this House so that any one could get at the total amount appropriated before we had appropriated any money." and then he says further, "Should the House adopt that order these appropriations would lie upon the table pending final passage until each member of the House could determine the total amount that the Legislature has spent." Now there must come a day after the first day of March when on the calendar will be placed all these appropriations, re-

solves and bills. There must come a field day when the public knows, when the Legislature knows, that all these bills and resolves are to be put upon their final passage or be defeated. Now the friends of resolves in this State who have come before committees and have had their hearings in regard to appropriations have gone to their homes all over the State, and on this field day to be appointed they must either return here or be absent. There is no question about it, we must look facts in the face. The larger towns and cities of this State are Augusta, Lewiston, Portland, Waterville and Bangor within easy access of this capitol. The large cities are clustered around the Capitol. There is a permanent lobby of those large cities at the Capitol. They are not absent. The little towns and little plantations scattered out in this great State of ours, cannot afford to come here and lobby for a little measure before this Legislature; and when this field day comes there will be present a lobby in the interests of these measures from the large cities and for the large appropriations and large measures.

Now two years ago in this Legislature the appropriation bills went through this Legislature without any party question being raised. Democrats and Republicans all agreed upon the appropriations of two years ago. Those appropriations were large, they were magnificent, they were for the interest of the State of Maine, and no appropriation has been attacked in the past, in the late campaign or in this Legislature, except the appropriation for postage stamps to the amount of ten dollars. And they won't be attacked. I have here a list of appropriations passed by the last Legislature, appropriations adding to the institutions of the State of Maine in the way of permanent improvements and permanent buildings of the State of Maine and the charities, where they have put their money into permanent improvements of building and land. I have here a list, Mr. Speaker, from the acts and resolves of the last Legislature making appropriations, as I say, for per-

manent matters in the State of Maine that will not have to be duplicated or repeated at this Legislature, for which not a cent will have to be raised. In other words, the appropriations have been made and the purposes for which they have raised have gone by and not a cent of those appropriations will have to be asked from this Legislature. Not one of those appropriations are for the maintenance of the institutions of the State but only for their permanent improvement; and if you stop here and do not add anything in the way of permanent institutions, in the way of improvements, if you do not enact any legislation on any new matters but simply make your appropriations to carry on the business of the State, the institutions of the State, for the two years to come, its running expenses, and so forth, and make those appropriations just the same as were made two years ago, the State of Maine will have saved over a million and a half of dollars that the Legislature two years ago appropriated for permanent improvements in this State which will not have to be saved by this Legislature because they are saved anyway, automatically saved. You won't have to raise a single cent of that; and if you go on, as I said, and take care of these institutions, of their running expenses for the next two years and the ordinary expenses of government, raise the same as you did two years ago, you will not have to raise the million and a half which you raised two years ago.

Now I do not think that anything is going to get through the committee on appropriations and financial affairs whose chairman is the Senator from Lincoln. I do not think that anything will get through that committee but what is proper and all right at this session of the Legislature; neither do I think that this House is incompetent to deal with that committee's report when it comes in here and to discuss and settle upon what should be appropriated as it is brought up when it is warm before us. Again, I am not accusing the Democratic party or its leader in this Legislature of doing any-

thing for political purposes, but this order gives an opportunity to the Democratic party to do things for political purposes and you cannot make the people understand it otherwise, and I don't want the Democratic party to be put in that position. (Laughter and applause.) Let this field day come in the month of March and let these bills all be assembled. I ask you who is going to get hurt? I would oppose this order coming from a Republican Legislature as I would from a Democratic Legislature because I don't believe in putting temptation before the Republican party. (Laughter.) Now when that field day comes I assume that the gentleman from Waterville, the leader of his party, wants these appropriations all assembled so that he, as the general public executioner of his party, can cut and slash somewhere and say: "We have made great economy in this Legislature for the people." Somebody is going to get hurt. Who will get hurt? Let me illustrate it. Two years ago this Legislature gave to a little school up here in the town of Blaine, a little institution for higher learning, \$300 a year for the two legislative years. That Legislature also gave to the School for the Feeble Minded the magnificent appropriation of \$100,000 a year for permanent buildings and carrying on the institution; and since we have met here in this Legislature at this session the gentleman representing the little district up in Westfield in which this school is located, has asked for an appropriation for his school. At the same time there has come down to us from the Senate an appropriation resolve for the School for the Feeble Minded offered by the old Democratic war horse from Knox, a bill calling for \$125,000 a year for the two years. Now this field day comes, and here is the little appropriation asked for in my county for a school up there of \$670 for the two years. They are too poor to have a lobby. They are not here. And here is \$270,000 asked for by the senator from Knox and his friends, from the committee of which he is chairman, from the special committee of the School for the Feeble Minded; and the gentleman from Waterville with his knife stands ready to cut the appropriations. I say there is a great tempta-

tion to stand by the senator from Knox and his measure and cut off the little Republican town up in Aroostook county. I don't want that temptation given to the Democrats. I wouldn't want it given to the Republicans. I say that when that field day comes there will be log rolling and trading and dickering; and the great, large interests of the State, the financial interests of the State, the great measures, will be protected and the lopping off will be done in little country towns and plantations.

Now this is called "the General Court of the people of Maine." The idea is that the people can come here to this court and obtain a square deal. Will you do it by such a measure as this? Will the deal by having these bills brought together and a field day appointed and the log rolling take place which will necessarily follow? I say that any institution or corporation or individual coming to this Legislature has a right to a square deal, and I say that every appropriation bill in this Legislature ought to stand on its own merits, stand or fall there; and you cannot give to the small towns and the humble plantations and the man who works with his hands a square deal by this order which gives an opportunity for the endowed institution of learning, for the wealthy city, for the large corporation, to trample the poor and the weak beneath the feet of might and power.

Mr. PATTANGALL of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped when I introduced the order the other day that it would so appeal to the business sense of this House that it might be passed without debate, and most of all without debate on my part because I have not felt in physical condition to debate it or do anything else but to sit in my chair since the Legislature assembled. But I realize now that that is too much to expect, that the gentleman from Yarmouth and the gentleman from Houlton could not let an early opportunity pass to make political speeches and to attempt to decide between themselves as to who should be the Republican leader of the present Legislature. (Laughter and ap-

plause.) Neither, it seems, could the attempt be resisted to suggest to the State that the gentleman from Waterville, who is a modest member of this assembly, was attempting to do something wicked in the interests of somebody other than the poor and humble citizens of the small plantations and the rural towns.

Now this order is a simple one. It is a business order, and as the gentleman from Ellsworth said, involves a business proposition. I do not believe in discussing it that it is necessary for me to attempt to make a stump speech. I do not believe it is necessary for me in discussing it to impute to members of this House political motives. I cannot conceive that any Legislature that ever assembled in Maine or ever will assemble in Maine would distinguish, no matter under what rule of procedure they acted, between an appropriation for a Republican town or an appropriation for a Democratic town. When the Maine Legislature gets to practicing legislation on that scale I do not care to be a member of it. It does not seem to me that there can be any politics in this matter. I cannot understand why even the names of political parties were necessary to be mentioned in discussing it; and I would say in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Houlton that if the Democratic party ever has a guardian appointed we will have one appointed from our own ranks. Now it seemed to me in coming here that it was necessary that some change in rules should be adopted with regard to appropriations. That thought came to me because of what occurred in the last Legislature. We came here undoubtedly intending to do our best for the interests of the people of the State of Maine, and simply because we did not know what we were doing we passed appropriations carrying a million dollars more than the revenue of the State for the last two years. The gentleman from Yarmouth and the gentleman from Houlton say that that was proper; but we have taken a verdict from the court of last resort, the people of Maine, on that procedure, and they said quite emphatically last September that that was improper. (Ap-

plause.) Nobody thinks it was proper. Nobody seriously thinks that any legislative assembly ought to pass appropriations so largely in excess of the revenue of the State that the State is compelled to resort to illegal methods to raise the money to pay its bills. Maine has a constitutional limit on its borrowing capacity. We can borrow but \$300,000, and today as a result of appropriations which the gentleman from Yarmouth and the gentleman from Houlton extol and ask us to keep on with, we have \$384,000 of warrants against our treasury extant with \$115,000 in cash to meet them. My friend from Yarmouth says the State is able to pay for what it needs. The State of Maine owes today better than a quarter of a million dollars that it cannot pay, has no means of paying, and has no means either to borrow money with which to pay. We must raise that money by taxation and we will proceed to do so, but in the meantime it seems to me that we should adopt some safeguard against repeating the folly which we committed two years ago of appropriating a total amount in excess of our revenue.

Now what is the order? One would think it changed the whole procedure of legislation. It does not. You will have your committee hearings, your resolves are considered by your committees in the regular way just as they always have been. The people from the little towns and small plantations and the men who work will be heard by these committees with precisely the same fairness and justice and impartiality with which they have always been heard, reports will be made to the House and Senate, the bills will pass their several readings and will be voted on and amended and treated as they always have been treated except in this respect, that after they have passed the amendable stage, after everything has been said and done with regard to them by this House that is necessary, they will stop on their final enactment until they can be assembled so that the total amount will be known; and then I have confidence enough in the wisdom and efficiency of this Legislature to think that if the total is

larger than the amount of money we see ahead of us in revenue the total will be cut down. And I think I can assure this House that, even though the House had not wisdom enough to cut down our expenses within our revenue, that presented in that way as a total so that the Governor of Maine can see how much is being appropriated, he has both the common sense and courage to cut them down for us if we haven't the common sense and courage to do it. We have this year a sort of a novelty in Maine. We have got a real Governor. We have ceased to have proxies in the executive chair. (Applause.)

I know of no man who left the halls of this Legislature two years ago knowing how much money we had spent. I asked that question of my friend from Yarmouth yesterday, if he knew when the Legislature adjourned how much money we had appropriated, and he frankly said, no. I did not, neither did any other man; and yet, gentlemen stand up here now and say that two years ago everybody knew from day to day just what we were doing. If that were true, that would be an awful indictment of the last Legislature. If the last House and the last Senate and the ex-Governor of Maine knew what we were doing when we appropriated a million dollars more than we could pay, then we committed a crime, whereas I believe we only blundered under the rules then existing, and were not much to blame for blundering, perhaps. This order may not be the best that can be drawn; this may not be the wisest way. I could think of no other way. If any other way suggests itself to any gentleman I should be very glad to have it brought up; but to continue in the old way, see what follows: A bill comes in providing an appropriation for a school or hospital that in itself is not objectionable. The amount asked for may be no more than would be wisely used. None of us can stand up and oppose it. It has merit. A committee reports upon it. We do not know but what the State can afford it and we vote for it. And another comes, and another and an-

other. Were they all assembled together and we discovered, for instance, that we had appropriated a couple of hundred thousand dollars too much it would be easy to scale them all down to a certain extent and bring them within the limits of the State's income.

Now it has been said that the State has not any fixed income, that we can appropriate all we want to, that Maine is rich and can afford to spend any amount of money. Let us think about that a little. You have pretty nearly a fixed income. You can estimate pretty nearly what the income of Maine is on the present basis of taxation. Of course you can raise taxes, you can make them higher if you want to, but if you do I am afraid there won't be much use for us to attempt to get re-nomination a year from next summer. The last Legislature tried that and it was not very successful. We want to lower taxes I think. That is my personal opinion. We want to keep our expenses within the present revenue of the State, and well within it. We have got not only to raise money to run the State for two years, but we have got to raise money to pay a million dollars more in order to put the State in the shape in which it was before this admirable system of appropriating money two years ago was inaugurated.

It was suggested by the gentleman from Houlton that in the last Legislature everybody agreed on all the appropriations. I am glad he said that because it gives me an opportunity to remind the gentleman from Houlton that on the largest appropriation passed by the last Legislature, of the 51 votes cast against it, 47 were cast by Democrats. All through the last campaign in newspapers and on the stump friends of mine like the gentleman from Houlton went about telling the people of Maine that we all agreed on these appropriations. I had the honor to be one of the members who stood in his seat in the last Legislature and inform the House as well as I could that when they appropriated \$350,000 for a State House and made no arrangement for raising the money they were putting Maine in debt; and we

were voted down. We did not agree. We fought that appropriation, we fought others as well as we could, but we were overborne by the majority. They had a right, if they wanted to, to inaugurate that party policy, to do what they did do. I don't want them to claim now that we helped them for we did not do it. Under this rule, if this order is adopted, any gentleman in this House, Republican or Democrat—and there ought not to be any politics in our appropriations at all—can have every right that he had under the old rules except the right to have his resolve finally enacted until every other member can see how much money is being spent. That is all there is to it. It is what every town meeting does, it is what every business corporation does, what every business man does, to figure up his year's income and look at all his expenditures before he begins to lay out his money. I don't believe there would have been any objection raised to that proposition on the floor of this House by anybody if it had not been unfortunately presented by some one who was supposed to be more or less prominent in Democratic politics and so gave an opportunity to my friends to make stump speeches and to talk about the gentleman from Waterville a little. (Laughter.) The gentleman from Houlton says this would create a revolution. God knows we need one. (Laughter.) When you found the State of Maine with its credit absolutely exhausted, when you came in here, when you found its treasury empty and its warrants floating around like the town orders of Plantation No. 14 with nobody to take them, we ought to have a revolution and it is pretty near time that we had one. (Applause.)

Another proposition is presented to us, that when these bills are all assembled here there is going to be a field day and an awful lobby is going to assemble and in some mysterious way that lobby is going to pass what it wants and the lobby is going to call for appropriations for the big cities and is not going to want appropriations for the little towns. Now if the gentleman from Houlton will glance over the appropriations for the last 50 years he

will find that Aroostook county has not suffered much. Maine has been fairly generous to Aroostook county. There has been more money from the State spent for the county of Aroostook than for any four counties of the State. I am glad of it. The cities as a matter of fact, do not as a rule ask for many appropriations. I cannot recall but one special appropriation being granted the city of Waterville, just one, when Colby University had a building destroyed by fire the State appropriated \$15,000 towards helping them replace the building. But suppose I was wrong about that. Does the gentleman from Houlton so underestimate the intelligence of this House that he thinks that even in the presence of a large lobby we could not discriminate with regard to what was right and what was wrong? I never have had that awful fear that seems to possess some gentlemen that if the corridors and floors of the House were filled with a crowd from the large cities that they would therefore force me to vote unjustly toward some little town. I think I should make up my mind myself when that field day came. Why should there be a field day? Why should not this House do as every other legislative assembly on the face of the earth does, make up its appropriation bill in whole when it gets to it after suggestions have been made by the finance committee, by the Governor, by the State treasurer, the State auditor and other responsible officials—make up that appropriation bill as a whole and then resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole and discuss it section by section and item by item even though it took two or three days. If we started on it the first of March, suppose we devoted the whole first week of March to that important work and got it ready and went to the people with a just appropriation bill brought within the revenues of this State. Wouldn't that be far better than though we went back to the old system of giving away other people's money without knowing how much we were appropriating and making ourselves popular for the moment and finally disgusting the entire people of the State with our prodigality so that they would return a new body

of men here two years from now? (Applause.)

MR. DAVIES: Mr. Speaker, If the House will bear with me for just a moment. My ideas and those of the gentleman from Waterville as to what a stump speech is do not entirely agree. I have no desire however to discuss the matter with the House, but as some personal reference was made to myself, something said about a conversation which the gentleman from Waterville says he had with me yesterday, I desire to say something as to that. For my part, I do not remember of the gentleman from Waterville asking me if I knew how much the Legislature appropriated at the last session. Assuming that he did ask me that question, and assuming that I said I did not know, I do not think there is anything strange about that. I should doubt very much whether any person could state, no matter how they might have been connected with the business of the Legislature in 1909, the exact amount which the Legislature appropriated.

Some reference has been made to the business sense of the order now pending. No one can deny that the business sense of the order is all right. The objection I have to the order is the political sense of it. I believe that it puts into the hands of one man—and I refer to the gentleman from Waterville and there will be no contests for the leadership in the Democratic party—the power to pass almost any bill and resolve that he sees fit. I am not the least surprised that his health is somewhat impaired after selecting and electing a candidate for Governor, after choosing a United States senator who will probably be elected tomorrow, after choosing a candidate for attorney general and deciding that that candidate shall hold the office as long as he wants him to and that he shall take the office when he pleases, after choosing a candidate for secretary of State and State treasurer—I am not the least surprised that his health is somewhat impaired, but he has entirely misunderstood my remarks. I wanted to relieve him if possible of some of the work and some of the care that

would naturally be incident to making the appropriations of this House.

Something has been said about the appropriation for \$350,000, for renovating and changing the State House. Do you not think it was necessary? The gentleman who controls the executive department of the State of Maine seemed to think so two years ago although his mind has radically changed since that time. Some of us remember his going through the lobby from day to day lobbying in the interests of the \$350,000 that was expended on this State House. He didn't object to it then. Undoubtedly the Governor of the State of Maine is a great man but is he as generous as he might be? Could we have expected any less of him when he delivered his message here than that he should say something about what was on the credit side of the State of Maine? Did we not have a right to expect that he would say something about the permanent improvements that have been referred to by the gentleman from Houlton? I think there is a great deal of political power that is tied up in this order, and you have come to the parting of the ways. The question for this Legislature to decide at the time this order is either passed or is defeated, in my humble opinion, is this one, whether almost the entire power of this body is to be lodged in the hands of one man or whether the power is to be used and distributed. That in my opinion is the question which is suggested by the order which is now pending. I suppose we must excuse the majority in some things. Let them ride their hobbies up and down the corridors of this State House, let them indulge in their high sounding moral phrases; according to their own statements, they are only to be in office for two years. The distinguished gentleman from Westbrook I think sometime ago said that a gentleman who was nominated was the father of the Democratic party and if the child repudiated the father the child was to die. I believe a distinguished gentleman here in nominating a candidate for Governor said that his candidate had been crucified, and he intimated

very strongly that the gentleman from Waterville was the administrator de bonis non of Judas Iscariot. (Laughter.) So we can rest assured that their lease of power is only for two years. The duty of the Republican party is perfectly plain. We are surrounded by material from which to build up the temple of 1912. The architect who can see beauty and fitness which to the untrained eye is rubbish, justifies his calling and he makes of the problem before him a reality. A little generous pruning, a little grain of charity on our part, it seems to me, will make the sunset of 1910 the sunrise of 1912. (Applause.)

Mr. PATTANGALL: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Yarmouth has almost convinced me that the order which I offered was not necessary. If on each small matter that comes up here we are going to listen to political speeches from the gentleman from Yarmouth, we won't reach an appropriation before March first anyway. (Laughter.) I don't know but what I was unnecessarily worried about getting at it too quickly. Now I want the House to vote on the order and not vote on any proposition involved in these debates that have gone on here.

The gentleman from Yarmouth saw fit to repeat another campaign story that went around all summer in which there was not and is not now a vestige of truth, and that was that the present Governor of this State lobbied for the State House appropriation. He did not. He took no part in the lobby. He had nothing to do with it. I only digress from the subject of the order under consideration because I am tired of hearing those things which are aside from the question. I hope gentlemen will vote for the merits of the order.

Mr. MURPHY of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I think this is a good business proposition that we have before us. We have tried the other method, and now let us try this one suggested by the gentleman from Waterville.

The question being on the passage of the order, Mr. Hersey moved that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

The motion was agreed to.

YE—Allen of Columbia Falls, Allen of Jonesboro, Ames, Anderson, Austin, Averill, Berry, Bisbee, Bogue, Boman, Bowker, Burkett, Campbell, Case, Clark, Colby, Connors, Copland, Couture, Cowan, Cronin, Cyr, Deering of Portland, Deering of Wadsworth, Descoteaux, Dow, Doyle, Dresser, Drummond, Dunn, Dutton, Emery, Farnham, Fenderson, Files, Frank, Gamache, Goodwin, Greenwood, Gross, Harmon, Hartwell, Hastings, Heffron, Hodgkins of Damariscotta, Hodgkins of Lamolne, Hodgman, Hogan, Jordan, Kelly, Kelliher, Knight, Lambert, Lawry, LeBel, Libby, Littlefield, Mace, Macomber, Mallett, Manter, Marriner, McAllister, McBride, McCurdy, Merrifield, Miller of Hartland, Miller of Palmyra, Morse of Belfast, Mower, Murphy, Noyes, Otis, Packard, Pattangall, Patten, Pelletier, Percy, Perkins of Kennebunk, Peters, Phillips, Pike, Pinkham, Plummer, Pollard, Porter of Pembroke, Porter of Mapleton, Putnam, Robinson of Lagrange, Robin on of Peru, Ross, Russell, Sawyer, Scates, Shea, Skehan, Sleeper, Small, Smith, Active I. Snow, Alvah Snow, Soule, Stetson, Stinson, Strickland, Thompson of Presque Isle, Thompson of Skowhegan, Trafton, Trim, Trimble, Tucker, Waldron, Weymouth, Wheeler, Wilkins, Williamson, Wilson, Woodside—108.

NAY—Bearce, Bann, Briggs, Buzzell, Clearwater, Davies, Davis, Dufour, Emerson, Hersey, Johnson, Kennard, Kingsbury, McCann, McCready, Merrill, Mitchell, Morse of Waterville, Newcomb, Perkins of Mechanic Falls, Powers, Snow of Bucksport, Weston, Whitney, Wilcox—25.

ABSENT—Andrews, Brown, Hedman, Monroe, Quinby, Trask, Turner—7.

So the order received a passage.

Election of United States Senator.

The hour having arrived to vote for a United States senator, the House proceeded to vote as follows:

For Charles F. Johnson:

Allen of Columbia Falls, Allen of Jonesboro, Ames, Bearce, Bogue, Boman, Burkett, Chase, Clark, Connors, Copeland, Couture, Cowan, Cronin, Cyr, Deering of Portland, Deering of Wadsworth, Descoteaux, Dow, Dresser, Dunn, Dutton, Emery, Farnham, Files, Frank, Gamache, Goodwin, Gross, Harmon, Hartwell, Hastings, Heffron, Hodgkins of Damariscotta, Hogan, Jordan, Kelly, Lambert, Lawry, LeBel, Libby, Mace, Manter, Marriner, McAllister, McCurdy, Merrifield, Miller of Hartland, Miller of Palmyra, Morey, Mower, Murphy, Noyes, Otis, Packard, Pattangall, Patten, Pelletier, Percy, Perkins of Kennebunk, Phillips, Pinkham, Plummer, Pollard, Putnam, Ross, Sawyer, Scates, Shea, Skehan, Sleeper, Small, Active I. Snow, Alvah Snow, Stetson, Strickland, Thompson of Presque Isle, Thompson of Skowhegan, Trafton, Trim, Tucker, Waldron, Weymouth, Wilkins, Williamson, Wilson—85.

For Frederick A. Powers:
 Anderson, Austin, Averil, Benn, Ber-
 ry, Bisbee, Bowker, Briggs, Buzzell,
 Campbell, Clearwater, Colby, Davies,
 Davis, Doyl, Drummond, Dufour,
 Emerson, Emery, Fenderson, Green-
 wood, Hersey, Hodgkins of Lamine,
 Hodgman, Johnson, Kelley, Kennard,
 Kingsbury, Knight, Littlefield, Macom-
 ber, Mallitt, McCride, McCann, Mc-
 Cready, Merrill, Mitchell, Morse of Bel-
 fast, Morse of Waterford, Newcomb, Per-

kins of Mechanic Falls, Peters, Pike,
 Porter of Pembroke, Porter of Mapleton,
 Powers, Robinson of Lagrange, Robinson
 of Peru, Russell, Smith, Snow of Bucks-
 port, Soule, Stinson, Trimble, Weston,
 Wheeler, Whitney, Wilcox, Woodside—53.

ABSENT—Andrews, Brown, Hedman,
 Monroe, Quinby, Tra k, Turner—7.

On motion of Mr. Percy of Bath,
 Adjourned.