

# 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-Ninth Legislature

OF THE

## STATE OF MAINE

---

1919

---

AUGUSTA  
KENNEBEC JOURNAL PRINT  
1919

## HOUSE

---

Thursday, February 13, 1919.

The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Philbrook of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

---

A message was received from the Senate, through its secretary, proposing a joint convention of the two branches of the Legislature to be held in the hall of the House of Representatives, and that an invitation be extended to Senators Poindexter of Washington and Hale of Maine and to Governor Bartlett of New Hampshire to address the convention at that time.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, the House voted to concur in the proposal for a joint convention.

On further motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, the clerk of the House was charged with a message to the Senate, signifying the concurrence of the House in the proposition for a joint convention.

The clerk of the House subsequently reported that he had discharged the duty assigned him.

---

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

---

### Senate Bills in First Reading

Senate 64: An Act to amend Section 36, Chapter 36, Revised Statutes, relating to hearings in case of violation of the apple packing law.

Senate 65: An Act to amend Section 4, Chapter 48, Revised Statutes, relating to municipal officers maintaining standards of weights and measures.

Senate 60: An Act to amend Chapter 37, Revised Statutes, by repealing Section 16, relating to capacity of milk cans.

This comes from the Senate, amended by Senate amendment A. In the House the Senate Amendment A was adopted in concurrence with the action of the Senate.

Senate 62: An Act to amend Sec-

tion 32 of Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relative to mill waste deposited in lakes and ponds.

Senate 50: An Act to repeal An Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the town of Grafton."

---

The following bills, resolves and petitions were presented and, upon recommendation of the committee on reference of bills, were referred to the following committees:

### Agriculture

By Mr. Washburn of Perry: An Act creating a bureau of animal husbandry.

By the same gentleman: Resolve to amend Chapter 18 of the Resolves of 1917, relating to animal husbandry.

### Education

By Mr. Adams of Searsmont: Petition of F. E. Miller and 17 others of Searsmont in favor of amending the school law so that all contracts for school supplies shall be approved by the superintending school committee, and also the board of selectmen, before the town is liable for payment.

By Mr. Colcord of Searsport: Petition of James P. Nichols and 33 others of Searsport, for same.

By Mr. Jordan of Cape Elizabeth: Petition of James L. Plowman and nine others of Scarborough, for same.

### Public Health

By Mr. Williams of Auburn: An Act to amend Sections 40, 41, 42, 43, 47 and 48 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, relating to medical inspection of school children. (500 copies ordered printed.)

### Salaries and Fees

By Mr. Lanpher of Sebec: An Act to increase the salary of the treasurer of Piscataquis County.

By the same gentleman: An Act to increase the salary of the county attorney of Piscataquis County.

### Sea and Shore Fisheries

By Mr. Perkins of Boothbay Harbor: Petition of Fred E. Newcomb and 42 others of Boothbay Harbor for the repeal of the lobster license law, and remonstrance against the passage of any law licensing fishing or fishermen.

**Taxation**

By Mr. Cunningham of Patten: An Act to provide for the taxation of timberlands in unincorporated townships. (500 copies ordered printed.)

By Mr. Alden of Gorham: An Act to provide for the employment of expert assistants by the Board of State Assessors.

**Towns**

By Mr. Jordan of Cape Elizabeth: Petition of James L. Plowman and four others of Scarborough, urging the passage of House Bill No. 2, providing for the election of road commissioners of towns.

**Ways and Bridges**

By Mr. Granville of Parsonsfield: An Act to amend Chapter 154 of the Public Laws of 1917, entitled An Act to provide State aid for the construction of highways extending continuously through three or more towns.

**Reports of Committees**

Mr. Weatherbee from the committee on legal affairs reported ought not to pass on bill, An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes relating to the time of opening and closing the polls at all elections of State and county officers.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported ought to pass on bill, An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the time of the opening and closing of polls at elections.

Mr. Garcelon from same committee on bill, An Act to ratify, confirm and make valid the proceedings of the Congregational parish in Abbot village, Maine, and bill, An Act to confirm the doings of the Abbot Village Congregational church, reported same in a new draft under title of An Act to ratify, confirm and make valid the doings of the Congregational Parish in Abbot village, and of the Abbot Village Congregational church, and authorizing them to unite, and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Stacey from the committee on sea and shore fisheries reported ought to pass on bill, An Act to authorize

the erection of a weir in the waters of Cobscook bay in the town of Lubec.

Same gentleman, from same committee, reported same on bill, An Act to amend Chapter 372, Laws of Maine, 1905, entitled An Act for the protection of clams in parts of the county of Sagadahoc.

Mr. Perkins from same committee on petition of Bradford E. Rowe and others, praying for the enactment of a law regulating the taking of clams in the town of Swan's Island, reported a bill entitled An Act regulating the taking of clams in the town of Swan's Island.

Reports were read and accepted and bills ordered printed under joint rules.

**First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves**

House 137: Resolve in favor of a fish screen at the outlet of Sebago lake.

Senate 48: An Act to extend the charter of the Lincoln County Street Railway.

Senate 58: An Act to amend Section 2 of Chapter 194 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915, amending the act establishing a municipal court for the city of Auburn.

Senate 59: An Act to amend Chapter 636 of the Private and Special Laws of 1871 establishing a municipal court for the city of Lewiston.

House 128: An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, relating to regular sessions of county commissioners of Hancock county.

House 129: An Act to extend an act entitled, An Act to incorporate the Odd Fellows' Home of Maine.

House 130: An Act to amend Section 23 of Chapter 78 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the acknowledgment of deeds.

House 132: An Act amending Sections 20 and 21 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 261 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to moneys received from the sale of timber and grass on reserved lands.

### Orders of the Day

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Am I in order, Mr. Speaker, in calling up the order tabled February 11th, that all acts and resolves shall be engrossed in printed form by the Legislative printer before final enactment or passage?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that this is specially assigned for today.

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I will very briefly state my position at this time. On Tuesday of this week I introduced this order, at the same time having it tabled, in order that there might be no hasty action and that members might familiarize themselves with the subject matter of the order; and I rise at this time regarding that order to request the unanimous consent of the House that I may withdraw the same, and if I may state first a brief explanation of why the order was introduced, and then why I ask the permission of the House at this time, having introduced it only upon Tuesday to be allowed to withdraw it. I will state my position as clearly as I can.

In the first place, the order has to do with the engrossing of bills—of acts and resolves, the law providing that the engrossing shall be done by printing. There has been hitherto for a long period of years—over half a century—a system in vogue in this State of engrossing all bills by printing. Very recently there has been attempted to be substituted a new method, to wit, the engrossing by typewriting. I understand that the reasons advanced in support of this new departure are reasons chiefly of economy. Now with reference to any matter of this type, as I conceive it, the controlling reasons are threefold, namely, economy, efficiency and expediency—the latter fully as important as either of the others.

Upon the matter of economy I believe it is suggested that there will be a saving to this State of five or six thousand dollars by typewriting them. Of course that is a substantial sum, and we are all imbued with the idea and necessity of economy, and

none of us are desirous, despite any intimations or suggestions, official or otherwise to the contrary, of running riot with the State's money; and so if five or six thousand dollars can be legitimately and properly saved, I conceive that every member of this Legislature is very anxious so to do, but this is hardly a fair test the way it is put up. I believe it is estimated that the new method will cost some two thousand dollars, the initial charge, as contrasted with the old method of eight or nine thousand dollars; and that figure ergo shows an apparent saving of seven thousand dollars at once. It is a fact, however, well known that by a new arrangement made in regard to the size of the page and size of the type, if printing is found to be desirable, money can be saved and economy thus indulged in, and still preserve the former system, if it be found desirable. On making certain inquiries outside in that regard I find that there can be a very substantial saving to the State of Maine—and the Department in charge of this matter under the statute has been informed in that regard—by the substitution of smaller type, a saving perhaps of four thousand dollars; so that this engrossing might be done in this way, as it has been by long custom, and not cost the State over four thousand dollars. Therefore, you get down to a narrow proposition on economy of a couple thousand dollars. But it seems to me there are higher and more controlling reasons than mere economy; that there is a proper field for economy, but there is an application, even in these days, of the old adage of penny wise and pound foolish. The matter of efficiency immediately enters into my mind in this matter of engrossing by printing. There is the obvious advantage of having a long bill set up in the number of workmen necessary to the production of a bill such as I have now in my hand, which is fairly long—not unduly long—not so long as some bills that have been passed by Legislatures in this State hitherto. Many workmen have been engaged in setting that up under the printing system; in some instances seventy-five are used, twenty

very frequently, and seven invariably. You have this bill, then, set up in long form and many bills are frequently before the Legislature that go to a committee of conference. There are suggestions and changes made even in the dying days of the session, and it becomes necessary to insert in Section 29 perhaps five lines, or perhaps a new section entirely following Section 23. Under the printing system it is simply necessary to strike out what is desired, insert the correction, and it then comes forth in complete form without delay. That is the highest degree of efficiency. Now under the attempted substituted system but one typist can be employed on one of these bills, and I submit that this is a matter well-known to anybody familiar with documents that there cannot be a half dozen typists working upon one bill at the same time because there is a distinction and a difference between typists as much as there is between handwritings. Another reason is that you would have the copy of one typist in one place and the copy of another typist in another place, and you would have a botch and a jumble. Now further on the proposition of efficiency as to corrections; everybody makes errors, and I have yet to see the most accomplished and expert typist, whether a typist in the ordinary office, in commercial offices, or even in the office of a justice of the supreme court, who will not strike an e for an a or who will not make a period for a comma, and who in the stress of work will not make an error. It is natural, it is invariable. Now that is as likely to be in the fourth line from the bottom of page 47 of some important bill as in line 1, Section 1, of the bill. What are you going to do? Are you going to erase that, and have the erasure show, or are you going to rewrite the bill? I will submit that careful members of this Legislature, and good lawyers of the distinction of our House leaders, would never agree to any correction in a solemn law of the State that was going to be made other than by rewriting; and if that is to be done, then what becomes of your proposition of efficiency? Where, pray,

is economy, because if this Legislature is held up for even one day at the close of the session when you are all anxious to go back to your work, and to put off the duties of a statesman and put on the habiliments of everyday life? If you are held here for one day, even, at the close of the session, the actual amount that is alleged to have been saved by typewriting as against printing, disappears; it vanishes; it is gossamer-like.

Now further along this same line on the proposition of efficiency, how many copies are you going to get? I understand there were five typewriters purchased for this particular work and then I heard that there were nine. Now I am not certain just how many there are; but you cannot produce more than five or six legible copies at the outside—carbon copies. That is a fair and conservative statement. Now how many copies of the bill are wanted? Under the system now in vogue there are always produced two copies for the State—two original copies; one which is the law, and one copy additional for the State. Then two copies more printed for the use in the acts and resolves, and seven copies provided for other uses. Now very, very frequently—I am told almost invariably—on an important measure, the man who has championed that measure, who has introduced that measure, perhaps some constructive legislation—whose heart is in it, whose work is in it—that man desires a copy of that bill to take home to his constituents. The charter of a city or town may be changed, and very frequently as many as 25 copies are made under the present system. That absolutely vanishes under this new and substituted system—under this what I believe to be unwise system. Now I use that word advisedly as you will see a bit later.

Above the proposition of economy, above the proposition of expediency, I declare that there is a higher one. There are only three methods known to the Saxon of contributing to the organic substance of the law. Those three methods are by judicial interpretation, with which we have but little to do; by fiction, which is largely of judicial evolution, with which we have nothing to do; and with legislation

with which we have to do; and it is the most fertile, it is the most potent, and it is, I believe, the most practical method of adding to the substance of the law. We, as a coordinate branch of this government in the State of Maine, are functioning along that line. We are passing the laws which are introduced here. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, that there is something inherently, to me, at variance with the dignity of the law, with the solemnity of your acts, in the substitution of this new cabaret method, this method which is going along the hit-or-miss lines that is exhibited by the adage that kindling wood is plenty and cordwood scarce—this principle which is perhaps predicated upon the premise that "New conditions, new duties, teach, and time makes ancient good uncouth."

Now to me there is an inability, there is an impropriety, there is a lack of harmony between the substituted method—that it is necessarily a more or less slovenly attempt to retain and perpetuate the duties of a Legislature by typewriting as against the fixed, definite and certain method of printing. We never can tell what the future will evolve, and never should temptation be likely put in the way of any man, and never should it be made possible to tamper at any time with any act or resolve, or certainly with any law of vital public moment, as a public law. Any person wrongfully disposed—wilfully disposed—with an eraser in four minutes can remove a comma, a period, or a word from a typewritten law which will not be discoverable perhaps for months or years, but which when the occasion arises may affect the liberty, the property, and possibly even the life of some man or woman of this State. Now that is not a fanciful or overdrawn picture. You recently saw this Legislature a few years back very actively concerned with the interpretation of the word "post-office." Now I can conceive that a condition may arise by allowing the use of an eraser where the entire will of the State may be thwarted.

A very grave question must at once suggest itself to all men relative to the permanency of a type-

written record as contrasted with a solemn printed document.

Now these matters impressing me so strongly, you may say "why do you ask unanimous consent to withdraw this order if you are so thoroughly convinced of the justice of your position?" I will endeavor to answer, gentlemen. I availed myself of the opportunity afforded to others to investigate the matter just debated, and the first thing I did I looked at the statute. I found that the statutes of this State, Chapter 2, Section 53 say that bills and acts shall be engrossed under the direction of the Secretary of State for the use of the Legislature; that is all. Then it immediately occurred to me what does the word "engrossed" mean, and I fancy perhaps that many of you have the same idea that I had,—a mere putting together; but I thought there might be a technical and exact meaning to that and it is always well to find out what words mean. Definitions are important; so having recourse to the Century Dictionary, I find this: "Engross: To write out in a fair large hand, or in a formal or prescribed manner for preservation, as a public document or record. The engrossing of documents was formally executed in England, and for some purposes till a late period, in a peculiar hand, called the engrossing-hand, derived from the ancient court-hand, nearly illegible to all but experts. The engrossing-hand of the present day is a fair round hand, purposely made as legible as possible." Now it is what, the writing in a "fair large hand," or in a "formal or prescribed manner?" Necessarily that statute then narrows us right down to this: The statutes of the State are binding, and engrossing means that it must be written out. Engrossing is to be done by the Secretary of State, or under his direction, for the use of the Legislature. And it must be done how? It must be done in a fair large hand or in a formal or prescribed manner. Now my mind immediately turned to where is there "any prescribed manner?" Now it never does, as any lawyer will tell you, to rest confidently upon

the statutes. You understand the acts and resolves of this State are as much a part of the laws of this State as the statutes. By a resolve passed in 1820 the engrossing was directed to be done in a fair, large, legible hand, and that resolve of 1820 was the law of this State down to 1866. Gentlemen in those days were loathe to change, and perhaps they did not consider these matters of so much importance as we do; but I find in 1866 what is the controlling law, the law which is binding upon this Legislature until you change it, the law which is binding upon all departments of this government until it is changed, as follows: "Chapter 6, Resolved, that from and after the present session of the Legislature, all acts and resolves passed to be engrossed in both branches of the Legislature in lieu of being engrossed by writing as directed in a resolve approved January eleven eighteen hundred and twenty-two, shall be engrossed by printing in a fair and conspicuous type, upon suitable paper, leaving margins of sufficient width to bind the same into volumes of uniform size and appearance to those heretofore engrossed, bound and deposited in the office of Secretary of State, and with blank lines or spaces in each bill so passed and printed, for original signatures in writing and dates of passage and approval of the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Governor of the State."

That law, gentlemen, has never been changed; hence my reason for asking consent to withdraw a superfluous order. That law is binding today, it is obligatory, and you have not yet, notwithstanding the form of acceptance of the report of the committee on engrossed bills,—you have not yet accepted a legally engrossed bill; and until those bills are engrossed in accordance with Chapter 6 of the laws of 1866, this Legislature has not functioned in accordance with its own laws. The department or departments that think, either by direction or indirection, to avoid the mandate of that act are not functioning in accordance with the

laws of this State. I respectfully submit to you, gentlemen, that I am accurate in my position on this matter, and careful examination of all the revisions of the Statutes, with their repealing clauses, from 1820 down to 1916, will show an absolute silence upon the repealing of that resolve. The only statute having a repealing clause that would be at all in point is the statute of 1883, and that statute in its repealing clause, Chapter 2, Section 43, and Repealing Act, page 1001, Section 4 says: "The resolves passed during the years hereafter named and herein designated are repealed; but no other resolves are hereby repealed." The resolves repealed were of the years 1832, 1854, 1875, 1876, 1877 and 1883; and until there is some act passed by this Legislature with an emergency clause that resolve of 1866 will continue to be the law until ninety days after the adjournment of this session.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding I have perhaps delayed important matters, but feeling that this is a matter of State and that this was the appropriate time, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw a superfluous order, simply stating that as bills come up and are reported as truly and strictly engrossed, unless they are engrossed in accordance with the law, in order to be consistent in my position I shall be obliged to vote "no" because they are not engrossed until you change the law.

By a viva voce vote unanimous consent was given to the withdrawal of the order.

At this point the Senate came in and a joint convention was formed.

#### In Convention

The President of the Senate in the chair.

The Chair appointed as a committee to inform His Excellency, the Governor, and his guests, that the convention awaits their pleasure, Senator Davies of Cumberland and Representatives Barnes of Houlton.

The committee retired and subsequently reported that they had at-



tended to the duties with which they were charged, and asked leave to report that the Governor will attend upon the convention forthwith, with his guests.

Thereafter the Governor and Council and guests came in. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, His Excellency, Governor Milliken, who will introduce Governor Bartlett. (Applause)

GOVERNOR MILLIKEN: It is a very unusual and distinguished honor that we have today and I know I express your feelings when I say that it is not only our honor but our great pleasure, and is my personal pleasure now to present to you Governor Bartlett of New Hampshire. (Applause)

GOVERNOR BARTLETT: Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the joint convention of the State of Maine: I thank you from the bottom of my heart in behalf of the good people of my state for this splendid welcome and mark of respect and cordiality which you are now extending to them through me. It is a grand thing, I believe, in these new days, that we cultivate the spirit of brotherhood not only within the state but as between the states. At a time when the nations are talking about being brothers to each other, it is high time that the states were in that intimate brotherly relation.

There are no two states which should enjoy more friendly and cordial relations than these—New Hampshire and Maine—two of the old states who have grown up together in their traditions, who have had their heroes and their statesmen in years past friendly, cordial, co-operating for the public good, and who now in these later days have had the joy and pride and inspiration to know that their boys, their sons, their soldiers, have been united shoulder to shoulder, fighting for liberty and dying for their country in that grand and gallant 103rd Regiment. (Applause) If there is anything in this wide world that would make the people of New Hampshire and the people of Maine feel a closer kinship it is the knowledge that your boys and ours have fought and died

together, and many of them are now sleeping the sleep of death together in the battle-stained fields of France.

I have asked your Governor to come over to New Hampshire and visit our Legislature, and it will be the pleasure and joy of our lives to have him there, to sort of cement in reciprocal relation this new tie that binds us through the blood of the 103rd Regiment.

Some of you may think I am down here on a little more mercenary errand. We would like, my good fellow citizens, fellow American citizens, we would like to be joined just as close to you physically as we are in friendship, and we would not object to being a very close partner of yours in any effort which might make it possible for free men in free America to step over the State line without paying for the privilege. (Laughter and applause) I have sometimes thought it was somewhat of a travesty on the word "freedom" that veterans of the Civil War, who fought in order that there might be a more perfect Union, should be obliged to pay three cents when they step on the union between these two states. (Laughter) And nothing would give us any more pride, nothing would any more closely unite us, than to say to these gallant men of the 103rd who have come back, that those they have left behind representing the two states should be forever remembered by a beautiful physical union of the two states which should be erected to their memory forever. (Applause) I know you are here as I am at least in part to welcome our most distinguished guest from the Pacific coast, one of the fine statesmen of the day, typical of all that is grand in American history, inspiring by his very life as others whom we emulate.

Again thanking you for this special welcome and trusting that you will lean us for at least one day your splendid Governor, I again thank you. (Applause)

The CHAIRMAN: It is a great pleasure and a distinguished honor for the Chair to present to you a man who needs no introduction to the State of Maine, who will introduce Senator Poindexter.

I have the great pleasure of presenting to you our own senator, Frederick Hale. (Long continued applause)

SENATOR HALE: Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Convention: I am delighted to be here today. It is a great honor and a great privilege to be called to address the Legislature of the State of Maine, and it is a great pleasure to me, especially, that I am going to address you today by proxy.

On the extreme northwestern shores of this country of ours, the New England states have what is practically a seventh New England state, and that is the state of Washington. Washington was settled largely by New England people. The people out there are not like what we consider the ordinary Western people. They are much like the people of the East. Their interests are like our interests, and when we want to do things in Washington we feel that we can count on the help of the people of the Pacific slope, and especially of the North Pacific slope. Now I am very glad to come here today and to introduce to you one of the strong men of this country, a man whom I have known well in Washington, with whom I have served on committees and with whom I have been thrown in very intimate touch. I believe that he will make an address today that will stay in your minds and hearts for a long time to come, and I take great pleasure in introducing Senator Poindexter of Washington. (Applause)

SENATOR POINDEXTER: Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Legislature: The important stones in any great structure are the corner stones. In the familiar picture of the map of the United States you will notice that one of the corner stones is this great State of Maine, and upon the opposite corner, the corner stone in the structure of the Union which guards the Pacific is the state of Washington. And the state of Washington will be proud and happy if in guiding the ideals and the traditions which we in common with you have

inherited from our fathers, we can make a record as enviable as that of this great State of Maine. It is a very great compliment from my distinguished colleague, your young and brilliant senator, to have him say that the people of Washington are like those of New England. We regard it as a compliment. And it is true. It is true for the reason that in great part they are New Englanders. They must of course be like New England because they are of New England. They have come from your State, from this peculiar section of the Union with its special traditions, with its record of patriotism and of service in the establishment of the Constitution and its preservation, and have brought those traditions and ideals and set them up there around new hearthstones in the farther border of the land. And so I find that in coming even so far as from the Pacific coast, meeting a typical assembly of citizens of a state of New England, I find myself at home and that there is no essential difference between American citizens in the extreme northeast corner of our great continental domain, and the extreme northwestern corner.

I congratulate you upon having Senator Hale to represent you in Washington. It has been my privilege to be thrown with him, to be particularly associated with him in our work in the Senate, and I have learned to love and to respect him, to admire his policies, and to realize that he is typical and representative of what we in the northwest have set up for our political ideal. He is a progressive statesman, and that is one we regard as sanely advancing along the evolution in the settlement—the inevitable changes which we must deal with in the settlement of our great economic and social problems.

We are facing now one of the great new epochs which constitute the changing history of a people. We are at the parting of the ways. We have just emerged from the greatest war in history in which we have played a most glorious, although a comparatively small part; it may be a decid-

ing part, coming as we did at its close and at a period of exhaustion of the great contending belligerents upon the blood-stained battlefields of France and Flanders.

The great work that lies before us is the readjustment of the affairs of the people of the world, and the problem which confronts you and confronts us all is to so readjust these affairs that when we are settled again into the normal ways of peace we will find, if it is possible for us to find, that we have not departed entirely from those great anchorages of American belief and American principle under which we have grown and prospered until we have become not only a happy people, but the greatest people, the greatest nation in the world. I would consider you fortunate, or any other man who bore a part in the solution of these problems, if we could solve them that when they are solved we will still be the United States of America as it was founded by Washington and preserved by Lincoln. (Applause.) The fighting and the shouting of the captains is ended and the immediate business in hand is to establish peace. And my friends, when we have established peace, when with the exercise of such wisdom as may be at the command of the world the lines upon which various people must live in their relations with each other have been settled, the United States will be fortunate if its destinies and affairs are so guided that it will withdraw its forces and its interests from the continents of Europe and Africa and Asia, and concentrate the resources and energies of our government upon the peculiar problems of America. (Applause.)

No doubt you have followed, as I have, various steps in the negotiations which are now in process in Paris. No doubt you have noticed the accounts such as they have been, limited I am sorry to say under a censorship which seems to me to be rather belated now that the menace of military danger has been removed, but nevertheless it exists, and from such glimpses as we are allowed to have of what is proceeding in

the tribunal which means so much for the conditions under which our people will live in the future, we find that a great deal of the time which has elapsed since the 11th day of November, when the great belligerents signed the armistice and ceased actual conflict, has been expended in the effort to attain an ideal of perpetual peace. And while they have been expending the time and energies of this conference in the search of some philosopher's stone by which all wars would be prevented in the future, a dream which we would all fervently pray might come true, yet the blood of many peoples has been flowing and battles are still raging throughout Europe. It would almost seem as if we had forgotten to make peace at the present time while we are searching for some talisman by which peace would be procured in the future time. It would seem to me, if I may be allowed to say so, that the process might better be reversed, and that before undertaking, as we would all like to undertake, to so establish the affairs of human nature that the conflicting interests of man would never war again—we would first bring about the cessation of present hostilities and make peace in the world in our day. (Applause.)

Now these are problems in which you have a part. I have felt sometimes as if we were living under an illusion, and that we were seated as mere spectators at a play in which the mighty actors were taking their part, merely a matter of entertainment or of enjoyment for the time being, for the hour, of the audience. But that is not the case. This great spectacle, which has taken into its hands a wider control, more diversified interests affecting the various peoples of the world than any conference of men who have ever been brought together, are dealing with your affairs and my affairs. And there never were affairs, there never were issues to be disposed of in a Legislature or in a Congress or a Parliament that were more vital, that entered more intimately into the conditions of life, of every home in the land, than the issues which are to be settled in the conference in

Paris. One request I would make of you is to so regard it, so realize it, to inform yourselves by such means as may be available as to what is transpiring there, to fulfill that function upon which we, a peculiar people among all the peoples of the world, have prided ourselves, of determining our own affairs, of being a self-governing people, of participating in the settlement of the questions which affect our lives and destinies, and that you will discuss them, and that there may be developed from this discussion and from this interest a body of public opinion in the United States which at some opportune time may bring itself to bear upon their final solution.

I cannot discuss now, amidst the busy days of this law-making body of the great State of Maine, the broad issues which have been presented for determination at this conference. You are familiar with their outlines at least. Many of them have been talked about a great deal, and written about a great deal, but very few of them—and I say it without the intention of offending any one at all—very few of them have been defined. We know what their names are but we do not know what they mean. I doubt very much whether there is anyone here, including myself—I may be mistaken, there may be someone here who can tell what is meant by the great question which is occupying the time of the Peace Conference, "the freedom of the seas." I doubt very much whether there is anyone here who can define what is meant by the great question, which is being determined there and which may affect your business, may affect the conditions of your State as well as of the world, of the "removal of economic barriers." I think I know what those words mean, but when the gentlemen who proposed that policy are approached they say it means something else. But they do not tell us what it means.

We are asked to support certain policies which we have in name only. I would ask you as parties to the contract to inquire what its terms are going to

be before you sign it. That is the proposition. (Applause.) We are asked to merge the government of the United States into a government composed of all the other leading nations of the world under the designation—formerly it was called a league of nations, now it is called a society of nations to enforce peace. It is a good deal like the Irishman who said he was for peace and he was willing to fight like hell for it. I always thought of that when I heard of a league in the name of perpetual peace which proposed to enforce peace. I have never heard of anybody enforcing anything upon a great independent, sovereign people without war. Enforcing peace upon the United States, if the United States should undertake again in the defense of the lives and interests of its citizens to enter into a war, or for the preservation of the Union as we did under Abraham Lincoln, or for the establishment again of independence as we did under Washington—any league of nations that undertook to dictate our course in such an emergency and to enforce it upon us, could only do so by war. The very term implies war. We are all in favor of peace, we are all in favor of perpetual peace; but while we are in favor of these things we do not want to be led away to add to the issues which are going to confront us and to multiply the causes out of which war grows, merely because it is labeled perpetual peace. We will not come any nearer our perpetual peace and the avoidance of future wars by making ourselves responsible for the government of the Dalmation Islands, or of Kamerun and other German possessions in Africa, or Mesopotamia in Asia. And neither will we approach nearer to an era of avoidance of future war if we abandon that cardinal principle of American policy known as the Monroe Doctrine, under which we undertake to maintain in the Western Hemisphere the ideals and traditions of a free, representative republic, and take into our counsels for the joint disposition of these questions the lands of the continent of Europe under what is called a system of mandatories in which we would not take our decree from the sovereign voice of the

American people, but take it as the mandate from a council composed of the foreign nations of the world.

Certainly we ought to discuss at least such questions before we cast adrift from our moorings of old and venture into an unknown and tempestuous sea.

We ought as rapidly as we can not only to demobilize the army and reduce it to a peace basis, but in my humble opinion we ought also to demobilize the civil war structure of the government as rapidly as possible. We ought to repeal, in my judgment, the Overman act. We might have needed a dictator, or been willing to have a dictator in time of war, but we do not need one in time of peace. The unity of the American people in confronting the menace of foreign arms has given an example of patriotism which will go down into the ages, just as the deathless heroism of our soldiers in meeting unknown modes of warfare on the battlefields of France; and we are willing to center authority in the hands of our executive officials in order to meet those great menaces and to preserve our institutions. But there should be as rapidly as possible, when the fighting is over, and when peace has been reestablished in Europe, which has been long delayed, a demobilization of the war power of the government and a return to the free institutions which existed before the war. A great many of the powerful boards and commissions which have been established—and this has no reference to parties or matters—it is universal. It is a problem which rises high above the ordinary differences of political parties. These great boards and commissions into whose hands has been placed the expenditure of approximately \$30,000,000,000 of money, which comes—whether in bonds or whether in taxes, or whether a tax is levied upon wealth, or whether it is levied upon labor, or whether it is passed on in a tax on the prices of articles of necessity which are consumed by every man, woman and child—ultimately the \$30,000,000,000 must be raised by a burden levied upon the backs of the American people. And these boards, which have expended this money in ways which it would be mild to characterize as mere extravagance,

but which may have been in some instances unavoidable in the conditions created by the war, and which ought to be hereafter accounted for—and I hope will be investigated and will be accounted for—but as rapidly as possible we should establish again in the place of the extravagances of war a policy of the economy of peace (ap-  
plause), and provide for the retirement of our bonds, reduce our expenditures and reduce as rapidly as possible the taxes which must be levied upon the people. The War Trade Board, the War Industries Board, the Public Information Committee, ought to be demobilized, not to say abolished.

I got a letter the other day from one of my constituents, sending me an advertisement on a blank form, with a letter from the Public Information Committee, asking him to sign his name on a blank line for subscription for the Official Bulletin, and he asked me if the Government of the United States was going into the newspaper publishing business. I wrote him, not with my consent, that I would not vote any money out of the treasury of the United States to authorize the Government of the United States to publish an official bulletin. We do not need an official bulletin. We do not need official gazettes in the United States of America. It savors too much of the chancelleries of Europe. Whatever may have been needed during the war for propaganda, it ought not to be continued as an institution of peace. It is not a newspaper and never could be a reliable newspaper, because when a newspaper or official bulletin is published by an administration in Washington, whether it was a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, it is bound to publish things that are in favor of the administration and to suppress things that are against the administration. It is unreliable. It is not a newspaper in the sense of publishing facts which can be relied upon, and there is no occasion to continue it.

I think the powers of the shipping board ought to be curtailed. I would like to see again such encouragement

given that great industry in which once the State of Maine led the world, without shackles of Government restriction being placed upon it. A short time ago I received a protest against contracts for the construction of American ships being let to Japanese and Chinese yards. Ships that are built with American money by American officials ought to be built in American shipyards. (Applause) The other day there was filed in the Senate an official report from the Shipping Board in which it was stated that the Shipping Board would not allow a shipbuilder in the United States to take the contracts which were offered of some two million tons of shipping by the French Government. Prior to that time \$35,000,000 of business in the construction of wooden ships which was offered to the ship builders in the great timber state of Washington, went to British Columbia, because the Shipping Board would not allow the shipyards to take contracts upon private account. The shipyards of America, representing as legitimate, as honest, as useful, as desirable industry as there is in all the realms of business, ought to be encouraged, not prohibited, to take contracts for the building of ships to give employment to our returning soldiers and to our idle men, whether for the French government of for private account. (Applause) The shipyards on the Pacific coast now, at least in the State of Washington, are closed down. At the same time the cry goes out that soldiers being discharged from the army are out of work, that idle men are accumulating in the cities of the land, while there the implements of industry lie unused although the wages which have been adjusted between the representatives of the Labor Unions and the Government of the United States, on which both were represented, were a minimum of \$6.40 a day and the opportunity for a man to earn if he will as much as \$15 a day. And if a man wants to work at those wages in those shipyards, under the present system by which the business of the Government and contracting for ships is conducted, he is not

allowed to work although the Government needs ships and men need work. In some instances men's families are suffering because they are out of work and not allowed to work unless they belong to a labor union, which labor union is under the control of a small coterie of misrepresentatives of labor, not typical of the best of labor in the United States, but representing ideals and principles which have been brought to us from the Bolshevist element of Russia. I say, my fellow citizens, that a man has a right to belong to a labor union if he sees fit, and should be protected in that right, and I believe that labor unions have been a great benefit to the cause of labor and by improving the status of labor have improved the status of the general citizenship of the country, but by the same token I claim that no man should be coerced into joining a labor union and that he should be free to work under a government contract whether he belongs to a labor union or whether he does not. Those are some of the principles to be determined. I do not know how you feel about it or how you feel about the incipient revolutions in some of the governments of war-torn central Europe and Russia, or whether you as representatives of the substantial interests of this great State have given it thought, have made preparation or devised means for meeting it, but that is a problem which I would ask you to consider.

And now I thank you for your kindness in having welcomed me here and I consider it a great honor to have met you and shall be glad to carry back to the people of the State of Washington the impression which I have received in contact with the sturdy citizenship of our sister state. (Applause)

---

The Governor and Council and their guests retired.

---

The CHAIRMAN: The purpose for which this Joint Convention was called having been accomplished, the Senate will retire to its chamber.

Whereupon the Senate retired.

### IN THE HOUSE

The Speaker in the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The House is under orders of the day.

Mr. MILLER of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that the vote of yesterday morning whereby the several bills relating to the Compensation Law were referred to the joint committees on Judiciary and Labor be considered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state to the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Miller, that the bills are not in the possession of the House, but have gone to the Senate for concurrent action. The Chair will rule that the motion is not in order because of that fact.

Mr. MILLER: I understood, Mr. Speaker, that a motion would be in order this morning.

The SPEAKER: Did the gentleman make any statement to the House of his intention to move for a reconsideration?

Mr. MILLER: I did not.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that the motion is not in order because of the fact that the bills are not in the possession of the House.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, it was voted to take from the table report of the committee on legal affairs on bill An Act to amend Chapter 485 of the Private and Special Laws of 1901, as amended by Chapter 331 of the Private and Special Laws of 1909, relating to the Eastern Somerset Municipal Court; and on further motion by the same gentleman the report was accepted and the bill received its first two readings, and was especially assigned for tomorrow morning for its third reading.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton, it was voted to take from the table House Document, No. 131, relative to the payment of State aid to superintendents of unions of towns; and on further motion by the same gentleman, the bill received its second reading and was specially as-

signed for tomorrow morning for its third reading.

On motion by Mr. Allan of Portland, it was voted to take from the table An Act to reenact Section 24 of Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes, relating to when no succession tax shall be assessed on the stock, bonds, or evidence of debt of Maine corporations; and on further motion by the same gentleman the bill was referred to the committee on judiciary, in concurrence with the action of the Senate.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, it was voted to take from the table House Document, No. 100, An Act providing for the building of public wharves and for the establishment of adequate port facilities, and for advancement of commerce; and on further motion by the same gentleman, it was referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs in concurrence with the action of the Senate.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, as in previous sessions, I suppose it is understood that very little of the routine business will be done on Fridays. That is so that men may not be held over a day who live nearby and who are accustomed to go home. So the calendar becomes littered on Fridays, and if possible many measures should be taken off on Wednesdays and Thursdays; and I would like to inquire through the Chair of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Allan, if he has objection to removing from the calendar House Document No. 116, an Act to provide for the collection of agricultural statistics by assessors?

Mr. ALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever; but the question comes up how far that applies to the conditions of Portland, and by agreement with Mr. Alden of the committee I would like to have it remain until next week and then taken up.

The SPEAKER: Is there anything further under orders of the day?

Mr. MILLER of Auburn: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire if a motion would be in order to recall the bills from the Senate?

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of the opinion that it would be if the gentleman would present it in the form of a written order; but the Chair will also state that the day for reconsideration will have passed unless it is possible to get the papers before the House at this session. I think it is not improper for the Chair to state that the same action can be taken in the Senate if they have referred the bills jointly during the session of today—the vote of reconsideration can be taken there.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Patten: I would like to ask the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, if he would object to taking House Document No. 107 from the table?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, hears the inquiry.

Mr. BRAGDON of Perham: Mr. Speaker, I tabled this matter because I considered that it would endanger

the agricultural interests of my section, and in consultation with the forest commissioner afterwards he stated to me that he wished to offer an amendment. If the gentleman from Patten (Mr. Cunningham) wishes to offer the amendment I have no objection at this time to taking it from the table. I will say that I have an amendment of my own, not yet prepared, that I shall wish to offer, and perhaps it might be better to wait until next week and have both amendments offered on the same day.

The SPEAKER: Is the answer satisfactory to the gentleman from Patten?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: It is, Mr. Speaker.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.