

# 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

Tuesday, March 18, 1919.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Layton of Augusta.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: Communication from the Secretary of State transmitting list of Public Acts signed by the Governor.

In the Senate ordered placed on file. In the House ordered placed on file in concurrence.

From the Senate: Ordered, the House concurring, that the committee on appropriations and financial affairs is hereby directed to prepare the several payrolls of the members, officers, and employees of the Senate and House for attendance and services rendered during the present session of the 79th Legislature, in accordance with Sections 12, 13 and 14 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, and the several orders of the Senate and House authorizing the employment of persons or the purchase of equipment for the convenience of this Legislature.

Comes from the Senate read and passed. In the House passed in concurrence.

From the Senate: Resolve making an appropriation to assist, encourage and develop the poultry industry of Maine.

This was passed to be engrossed in the House March 5 and finally passed on March 10. It comes from the Senate referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs.

On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby the resolve was finally passed, and on further motion by the same gentleman it was voted to reconsider its action whereby the

resolve was passed to be engrossed. On further motion by the same gentleman the resolve was referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs in concurrence with the action of the Senate.

The committee on towns submitted its final report stating that it had acted on all matters referred to it. The report was accepted in concurrence.

### Senate Bills on First Reading

Senate 206: Resolve for the laying of the county taxes for the year 1919.

Senate 205: Resolve for the laying of the county taxes for the year 1920.

Senate 168: Resolve amending article IX of the Constitution so as to provide for a bond issue for the purpose of building and maintaining public wharves and for the establishment of adequate port facilities in the State of Maine.

Senate 204: Resolve appropriating money for the public roads of Oxford county in accordance with an act of Congress approved May 23rd, 1908.

### Orders

On motion by Mr. Granville of Parsonsfield, it was

Ordered, that 500 additional copies of House Document No. 373, remarks of Dr. Phillips of Bar Harbor on act relative to marriage of persons having syphilis, be printed for the use of the members of the Legislature.

### Passed to Be Engrossed

Senate 119: "An Act defining prostitution, lewdness and assignation and providing punishment therefor."

Senate 199: Resolve in favor of the State Tuberculosis Sanatoriums for maintenance and other purposes for the years 1919 and 1920.

House 56: "An Act to amend Section 37 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, compilation of 1916, relating to authorization of issue of stocks, bonds and notes by public utilities."

"An Act to increase the salary of the deputy treasurer of State."

(On motion by Mr. Allan of Portland, recommitted to committee on

bills in third reading to correct an error.)

House 413: An Act to amend Sections 11, 25 and 26 of Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes relating to itinerant vendors.

House 414: An Act to amend Chapter 289 of the Private and Special Laws of 1907 entitled An Act to incorporate the Livermore Falls sewer district.

House 415: An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 96 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the recording of chattel mortgages.

House 431: An Act creating bureau of animal husbandry.

(Tabled by Mr. Holley of North Anson pending third reading.)

House 433: An Act to amend Chapter 193 of the Private and Special Laws of 1917 entitled An Act to create the Auburn Sewerage District and transferring to it the sewer system of the city of Auburn.

House 435: An Act to amend Chapter 34 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915 relating to the Eastport municipal court.

House 412: Resolve for the maintenance and improvement of the State park in Augusta.

House 416: Resolve in favor of the town of Livermore, reimbursing said town for money paid to soldier's dependents.

House 417: Resolve in aid of navigation on the lower lakes.

House 434: Resolve in favor of the inhabitants of the town of Industry, Franklin county, Maine.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to authorize the construction of a weir in the tidewaters of Roque harbor in the town of Jonesport.

Mr. MULLIGAN of Nobleboro: I would move that this matter be tabled.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion failed of passage.

An Act to amend Section 33 of Chapter 52 of the Revised Statutes, relating to deposits by savings banks in institutions outside of the State of Maine.

An Act to amend Chapter 151 of the Public Laws of 1917, entitled An

Act to enable the chief engineer of the State Highway Commission to convey a certain lot or parcel of land owned by the State of Maine to the European & North American Railroad.

An Act to amend Section 176 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 79 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to the appropriation for teachers' pensions.

An Act to provide for the election of road commissioners by towns.

An Act to amend Section 136 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, relating to State aid for industrial courses in high schools and academies.

An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 40 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the filing of examination questions with the State librarian for public reference.

An Act to amend Section 12 of Chapter 76 of the Revised Statutes, concerning sale of estate of deceased non-residents or of minors out of the State.

An Act to amend Section 85 of Chapter 16 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 229 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to tuition paid by towns for secondary school pupils.

An Act to amend Section 21 of Chapter 83 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 56 of the Public Laws of 1917, relating to temporary loans by the county commissioners.

(On motion by Mr. Rounds of Portland, a viva voce vote being taken, the bill was tabled, pending passage to be enacted.)

An Act authorizing the American Realty Company to locate, erect and maintain piers and booms in the Aroostook river.

An Act to authorize the appointment of the Deering High School Commission in the city of Portland, Maine.

An Act to amend Chapter 215 of the Public Laws of 1867, entitled An Act to incorporate the city of Saco.

#### Finally Passed

Resolve providing for a state pen-

sion for Mrs. Alfred Polk of Lewiston.

Resolve in favor of the town of Brownfield for damage done by dogs.

Resolve, in favor of John G. Fleming for building a highway in the town of Wiscasset.

Resolve, in favor of Benjamin H. Varney, secretary of the committee on education.

Resolve, reimbursing the town of Lyman for expenses incurred on account of state paupers.

Resolve, continuing unexpended balance of appropriation provided by Chapter 321 of the Resolves of 1913, entitled Resolve in favor of aid in the construction of a highway bridge across the St. John river between Fort Kent, Maine, and St. Francis, New Brunswick.

Resolve, in favor of Jennie Hayford Tilley of Canton, for state pension.

Resolve, providing a state pension for Julia E. Adams of Litchfield.

The SPEAKER: We have one emergency matter, resolve in favor of the Penobscot tribe of Indians for the general care, maintenance, relief and education thereof. This resolve carries the emergency preamble and requires a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the House. All those in favor of the resolve being finally passed—

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, will the Chair kindly state the nature of the emergency?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will read the emergency preamble. "Whereas the State of Maine holds in trust for the Penobscot Tribe of Indians a certain large sum of money, to wit: eighty thousand ninety-two dollars and fifty cents, and whereas all the funds appropriated by the 78th Legislature, for the care, maintenance and relief of said tribe has been expended for the purposes and in the manner prescribed by law, and because of the lack of available funds said tribe may fall in distress and be deprived of proper food, shelter and clothing, and whereas, by reason of the foregoing facts the appropriation called for by this resolve is immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and

safety and in the opinion of this Legislature constitutes an emergency as contemplated by the Constitution, be it therefore resolved," etc. All those in favor of the resolve being finally passed will please rise and stand until counted, and the monitors will take the count.

A division being had,

One hundred and twenty-two having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, the resolve was finally passed.

### Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER: Before taking up special assignments, the Chair will announce the conference committee on resolve in favor of the town of Eagle Lake to reimburse said town for a part of the excessive expenses incurred in the influenza and small-pox epidemics, namely: Messrs. Rounds of Portland, Burns of Eagle Lake, and Pattee of Harmony.

The Chair now lays before the House as the first matter assigned for today bill, An Act to authorize Horace Cleland to maintain a fish weir in the town of Perry, House Document No. 334, tabled by the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, pending second reading.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to move the indefinite postponement of this matter upon the ground that all the evidence of the opponents was not presented at the hearing; but the committee on sea and shore fisheries has very kindly consented to re-hear the case and to consider such additional evidence as we may have to present for what it is worth. This will spare the House a tedious technical explanation, and I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee on sea and shore fisheries.

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House: I do not desire to take but very little of your time this morning to discuss this matter. Three weeks ago I think, after a full hearing, the committee on sea and shore fisheries unanimously reported to this House that this man, Horace Cleland, should be authorized to erect and

maintain a weir down on his shore privilege, opposite his land. The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, tabled it when it came into the House, and has re-tabled it each time it has come up to be disposed of; and it is in the record here, and he so stated, that he intended to offer an amendment. Now he says that he intended to have it indefinitely postponed, but inasmuch as he says that some members of the committee desire a re-hearing, he wants it recommitted. Now, gentlemen, I think that heretofore a unanimous committee report on a matter which is purely private legislation—if you look through the records of this Legislature and of previous Legislatures, that the unanimous report of a committee on purely private legislation—not public legislation—has been passed by this Legislature; and this poor farmer down in the town of Robbinston, after coming here to Augusta and appearing before this committee on sea and shore fisheries, whom you will admit are qualified to determine these questions, received from that committee a unanimous report in his favor, and he went back home satisfied that you would sustain that report, and so he went into his forests and cut the material with which to build that weir, and he has ordered the twine and marline that is used to put around the stakes to complete the weir. The gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) has been persistent in keeping this matter on the table and dragging it along, and now he desires it to be recommitted in the hope that by some influence he may get a report against it. Now I submit, gentlemen, under those facts that it is not proper to recommit. That hearing was fully advertised, and the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) himself came before that committee, and any other witnesses whom he desired to take there might have been there; and I say to you, gentlemen, that at this late stage in the session when there are so many public matters pressing for your consideration, and the committee on sea and shore fisheries, as well as all others, are so busily engaged in hearings, that this matter ought not to go back to the

committee; and I sincerely hope, gentlemen, out of respect to the committee and Mr. Cleland, who has gone ahead in good faith at a great expense to procure the material for this weir, that it will be unfair and unjust to recommit this matter. Gentlemen, I oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that I was not satisfied with the showing made by the opponents of this measure. Neither side was in possession of any figures as to distances. Those figures are not reliable—it was all guess work. The opponents of the measure themselves were unable to be present, because one of them is an old man, almost a cripple, and the other, his sister, was left a widow only a few days before this bill was introduced. There is no particular haste in making the preparations for the building of this weir. If this bill is passed, Mr. Cleland cannot begin operations there, as I understand it, until after the first of July. I believe it is a matter that should come again before the committee, because the explanation would be very tedious and difficult of understanding among men who are not versed in herring fishing; and I hope the motion to recommit will prevail.

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, just a word in reply. There was no more, and would be no more important witness for the opponents of this measure before the committee on sea and shore fisheries than the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, himself. He was one of the selectmen of his town and he has had opportunity to observe the location and has made careful examination of the premises—I think he will not deny that—so that so far as particular evidence is concerned, there is no man more qualified to give that committee information than the gentleman from Perry himself, and he gave it at the hearing.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the question that the bill be recommitted to the committee on sea and shore fisheries. Those in favor of the motion will say aye, those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted, A division of the House was called for.

Mr. PIKE: I misunderstood the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the question to recommit. All those in favor of the motion will rise and stand until counted.

A division of the House being had.

Fifty-six having voted in favor of recommitment and 66 having voted in opposition to the motion, the motion failed of passage.

Mr. WASHBURN of Perry: Is a motion to indefinitely postpone now in order?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that it is. Does the gentleman make that motion.

Mr. WASHBURN: I do, Mr. Speaker, and in support of that motion I wish to make some statements.

I did not feel, as I have stated to you, that the case of the opponents of this measure was very fully presented, and I have told you the reason why the two opponents themselves were not present; and I have told you that the figures regarding distances involved were not authentic. There were no reliable figures on either side; it was all guess work. I have since visited this location on my own account, and I came away satisfied that I could not conscientiously allow this bill to become a law without a word of protest. The committee on sea and shore fisheries gave me every courtesy in the matter, but they have more vexatious and troublesome problems to unravel than any committee of the legislature, because there is nothing that men will contend over so unreasonably and strongly as over fish rights, and it is possible that in the great number of matters of public importance that have been before them, they may not have sifted this small private matter entirely to the bottom.

I first want to describe to you briefly the general situation regarding the weirs of the town of Perry. These weirs, and there are no less than thirty of them on our shore, have been operated for the most part

by men who have been long in the business, men who have met the ups and downs of good fortune and misfortune of this precarious business and men who have been compelled for years to see the great schools of herring come into Passamaquoddy Bay and come to within a few feet of the back of their weirs, only to disappear in a single night and show up somewhere on the English side of the Bay for the rest of the season, and they have got along. Some of them have made a livelihood, some a little more and some a little less, until about two years ago when fortune changed and the herring became abundant, the price which had averaged five or six dollars per hog-head advanced to twenty-five dollars, and very suddenly and very naturally a great many men who never knew or cared anything about weir fishing before, became very much interested; and the board of selectmen, of which I happen to be a member, was flooded with new applications for weir licenses. They met the duty involved in the consideration of these new applications as best they could. It is always a disagreeable duty. In the discharge of that duty they were governed by only two things,—their knowledge of the situation and the statute which covers this matter. That statute is perhaps a little peculiar. It is not permitted that any man who owns a piece of shore front should go upon it and build a herring weir. He can build anything that he wants above high water mark; he can build almost anything he wants between high and low water mark; but outside of low water mark the title remains in the State, and the State, wisely or unwisely, delegated its jurisdiction to the selectmen. I am not prepared at this time to defend the justice of that provision, but it is the law, and is the only thing the selectmen of towns can go by. Among these numerous applications which our selectmen receive during the past two years—and let me say here that we have only refused two of them—was one from Mr. Horace Cleland, and the selectmen of our town advertised that mat-

ter, as they were required to do, and they did not treat it from a distance as is sometimes done. They met there upon the ground in full force, they passed the entire period of low water there upon the beach, they heard all the evidence, examined the situation thoroughly, and after a future executive session voted unanimously that Mr. Horace Cleland was not entitled to a weir privilege. No man on that board of selectmen was under any obligation or had any connection or association with either of the parties to this controversy, and the Chairman of our board of selectmen had had forty years practical experience as a weir fisherman. Our decision was reached upon the ground that the granting of this weir would be an injury to the rights of another weir fisherman, and that is forbidden by the statute; and this weir which would be injured by it is also owned by Mr. Cleland.

It increases the difficulty of presenting this matter clearly before you that both parties to the controversy have the same surname. I must ask you to keep these names in mind. Mr. Horace Cleland is the petitioner and Mr. James R. Cleland and his sister are the opponents. Mr. James R. Cleland is one of the men who has maintained a weir on this location for a great many years upon a license regularly granted by the selectmen of the town, bought and paid for. He maintained it for a great many years on the lower or southerly extremity of the territory granted him in his license, and with a fair degree of success. Then came the terrible winter of 1918, when this great bay with its fifteen miles of open water and its twenty-one feet rise and fall of tide, was frozen over, and men walked across it where probably human foot never stepped before, and ice formed around these from ten to thirty feet thick. When the time came in the spring for this ice to go out, the unfortunate weir owners could only gather along the shore and hope that when their weirs were swept away, they would be swept away entirely so that they could rebuild. Mr. James R. Cleland was one of the unfortunate

ones. The ice landed upon the top of his weir at high water, and as it went down, crushed it to the bottom as you would an egg shell, and there was a tangled mass of hardwood stakes from six to ten inches in diameter, bent, broken and twisted. Reconstruction upon that location was impossible without the services of a diver, and Mr. Cleland moved his weir up the shore, not 1600 feet up the shore, as the plan that was submitted by the proponents of this measure, but 600 feet or less. It is difficult to get exact measurements upon the water. His weir and the location was a failure. The confirmation of the shore is such that it turned the herring off and his weir was a loss to him. He has now decided to begin preparation for rebuilding on the old location, which we claim he has a right to do. We claim he has a right to move up the shore or down the shore—to build one weir anywhere within the limits of his license from the town.

The best way I can perhaps bring this matter before you is by explaining that it takes a considerable space laterally upon the shore to accommodate the modern weir and all its appurtenances. Besides the weir there must be boats, moorings, rafts for drying seines,—and I want to correct an impression which may have crept into the minds of some of you during the controversy over a similar case last week, to the effect that the more weirs we have, the more fish. That is absolutely incorrect. It should be borne in mind that in order for these fish to be caught, they must be caught on the inside or shore side of the weir. They must first pass in between these weirs and get upon the shore side in order to be in a position to be caught. They are the most timid fish that swim, and there never should be less than a thousand feet space clear between the weirs and their various appurtenances. The Canadian law in force upon the opposite side of the Bay, I am informed requires arbitrarily 1000 feet. In only one other instance in the history of herring fishing upon this bay has the Legislature over-



ridden the decision of the board of selectmen, and that act, drawn by one of the ablest attorneys Washington county ever had, provided the weir should be built provided there was a thousand feet of space between it and any other legally established weir.

I want to ask you this question in summing the matter up: Here is a small piece of shore front, some trifle over 600 feet in width, belonging to these two men together. There is room there for only one successful weir. Expert testimony upon this point would bear me out if we could reproduce it here. Now who has the better right to that weir, James R. Cleland, who owns two-thirds of that shore, who has paid the taxes on two-thirds of it, who has a legal license from the town, bought and paid for, who has depended upon it as his business for years, or Mr. Horace Cleland, who owns one-third of it, who has been refused a license by an impartial board of selectmen, and whose business activities extend in other activities.

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for me to prolong this argument. I have only precipitated it upon this House in the firm conviction that I am right in the matter. I have moved the indefinite postponement of this bill because I believe that it is an injustice and that it will injure the rights of James R. Cleland and his widowed sister. It is a little bit unfortunate, not to say significant, that this act was introduced within a few days after the death of the only member of this company, James R. Cleland and his brother, who could be active in defense of himself. I believe that it is not in accord with the Statute, and I believe it is a bad precedent to establish. The State having been given the solemn jurisdiction over this matter should not interfere with it except in case where prejudice on the part of the board of selectmen can be proved.

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to take much of the time of this House in the disposition of this matter; but it seems that something should be said in reply to the gentleman from Perry.

I want, first, gentleman, for you to get clearly into your minds the situation of the shore privileges down there. James R. Cleland and Horace Cleland are adjoining land owners. The shore frontage of Mr. J. R. Cleland is, I think, at least three times as much as that of the short frontage of Mr. Horace Cleland; and if that is not correct the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) will correct me. Heretofore, on the south line of Mr. J. R. Cleland's property, which adjoins Mr. Horace Cleland's property, Mr. J. R. Cleland has maintained a weir close to the line of Mr. Horace Cleland's property. Now while that weir was so maintained, Mr. Horace Cleland did not desire to erect a weir opposite his premises, because, as you will see, a proposed weir would be very close to the weir of J. R. Cleland; but when that weir went down, gentlemen, and as we thought abandoned, and Mr. J. R. Cleland moved up his shore 600 feet further, we thought then there ought not to be any reason why Mr. Horace Cleland could not maintain a weir in front of his premises and just as far as possible from the premises of Mr. J. R. Cleland, way down to his south line. The description in this bill is that he shall erect his weir in the line between Horace Cleland and Nellie Golden, which is his line farthest removed from the premises of J. R. Cleland. Now the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn) has not stated the distance between the former weir maintained by J. R. Cleland and where he now maintains one. Now I do not think it is fair that one year Mr. Cleland may go down to the south line of his shore and build a weir, and then for some reason abandon it and go way back nearly to his other line and build another weir, and yet the gentleman who owns the adjoining premises cannot build any weir at all anywhere in front of his premises. Now the distance between the proposed weir of Horace Cleland and where J. R. Cleland now maintains and is fishing a weir—not the one that he has abandoned close down here to Horace Cleland's line, but the one he is now maintaining—

is in my judgment approximately 1000 feet. These questions were all submitted to the committee on sea and shore fisheries, and the gentleman from Perry (Mr. Washburn), who was the selectman and who examined those premises as I have heretofore said, is the most important witness to give that committee information, and that committee saw no reason why, inasmuch as J. R. Cleland had elected to abandon the location adjoining Horace Cleland and to go farther up his shore 600 feet and build another weir—that this committee might properly and with justice give Horace Cleland the right to build a weir down on his south line farthest removed from the premises of J. R. Cleland.

Now, gentleman, I shall not take any more of your time in discussing this matter. It is a majority report of expert men—the committee on sea and shore fisheries; and I submit that it ought not to be overridden, and I ask you that you respect it and support it, too. Bear in mind also that this poor farmer on the strength and faith in that report has gone to great expense and great labor in cutting the material and hauling it out to the bank and in placing his order for marline and twine, an expense of approximately five hundred dollars. Now this is all I have to say, gentlemen. It is a question of simple justice, and I leave it with you believing that you will do justice.

Mr. BUZZELL of Belfast: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word on this question. The other day I was against my colleague from Eastport (Mr. Pike) who has just spoken, in the fish business. Today I want to go fishing with him. I believe that this is an instance where we are doing wrong to another man as we did in the case of Mr. Look the other day, or was about to do. While I have all regard for the honest judgment of my colleague from Perry (Mr. Washburn), it seems to me that we are taking the best judgment of ten good men on this committee. There is such a thing as three good men, selectmen of a town being prejudiced. This is the greatest port

in the State of Maine. We are not personally prejudiced. We want to look at these things from a fair, square, honest viewpoint. It has already been said that one of these Clelands is a man of affluence and influence, while the other is not so much so. Is it fair to let one of those men roam around on the shores of that bay for twenty odd hundred feet and place his weir wherever he wants, and exclude the other man from putting a weir up there anywhere within that distance? My colleague from Perry (Mr. Washburn) states that the evidence for the opponents was not fairly presented. I think it is fair to say that he was there, and that wherever he is, the side that he leans toward is presented in a very able fashion because he is one—and I wish to pay him this tribute—of the ablest men in this House; and for him to say that that side was not represented as it should be is not giving himself sufficient credit. I hope that his motion will not prevail.

Mr. WASHBURN: Mr. Speaker, just one word more. There has been an intimation here that there is a very poor man involved. Let us be entirely fair in this matter and say that neither of these men will suffer poverty through the passage or defeat of this bill. They are both good citizens, they are both extremely prosperous, four-handed farmers. I wanted to clear that point up.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Washburn, that the bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed no.

A viva voce vote being doubted,

A division of the House was had.

Fifty-two having voted in favor of the motion and 74 against it, the motion to indefinitely postpone failed of passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the bill was abled pending its second reading.

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: If in order, Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill have its several readings at the pres-

ent time under suspension of the rules

Thereupon the House by a viva voce vote suspended the rules, and the bill received its second and third readings and was passed to be engrossed.

The Chair lays before the House bill an Act to amend the charter of South Portland, House Document No. 149, tabled by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinckley, pending commitment to committee on bills in third reading.

Mr. Hinckley presented the following amendment:

House amendment A to House Document No. 194.

Amendment A. An Act to amend the charter of the city of South Portland is hereby amended by striking out the word "two" in the fourth line of the first paragraph, and substituting therefor the word "five," and also by striking out the word "two" in the thirteenth line of the second paragraph and substituting therefor the word "five"; so that said act as amended shall read as follows:

Mr. HINCKLEY: Perhaps I might say, Mr. Speaker, in explanation that the charter of the city of South Portland at the present time provides that the city can own property only to the extent of \$100,000. The city probably owns today in schoolhouses and other property two or three hundred thousand dollars. This is simply to extend that right to \$500,000. Perhaps that explanation will save reading further in detail.

Thereupon the House by a viva voce vote adopted House Amendment A to House Document No. 194.

On motion by Mr. Hinckley, the bill as amended was committed to the committee on bills in third reading.

The Chair lays before the House bill an Act concerning the granting to the county commissioners of the county of Cumberland the right to sell or lease certain property, House Document No. 302, tabled by the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Murray, pending third reading.

On motion by Mr. Murray of Portland the bill was given its third reading.

Mr. WILSON of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I move to table the bill pending its passage to be engrossed.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to table failed of passage.

Mr. ROUNDS of Portland: Mr. Speaker, in talking with some of the county delegation there was to be an amendment to that bill. It was brought out at that time that there was a farm of 300 acres and only three inmates, and it had gone behind \$9,000. There were 40 head of cattle, six employees and other small animals. There was to be an amendment that we would not allow them to sell, and I supposed the chairman, or secretary of the delegation, would have that amendment that they could not sell that county farm, because he was afraid that the county commissioners might give the away, and that is why we wished to have it laid on the table for amendment. I hope as long as they have brought it up that this thing will be voted down—ought not to pass—I move that we indefinitely postpone the bill.

Mr. HINCKLEY of South Portland: Might I ask what the report of the committee was on this matter?

The SPEAKER: The report of the committee was a bill in new draft, ought to pass. The bill is now at the stage of passage to be engrossed, having had all its readings.

Mr. HINCKLEY: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a case where we must assume, without evidence to the contrary, that the committee heard the evidence and that their decision on the matter should be given very serious consideration. I am not afraid to permit the county commissioners of Cumberland county the right to sell that property or any other property. This county farm is one of the bad effects of enforced prohibition. At the time that farm was purchased, a matter of only about eight years ago, it was absolutely necessary to have such a place to take care of our inebriates. Now on account of the fact that the prohibitory law has been in force we are in a position to dispose of the property because we can find no inebriates down in Cumberland county to send to

the farm (applause). I move, Mr. Speaker, that the bill have a passage.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that there is a motion before the House to indefinitely postpone, which takes precedence.

Mr. HINCKLEY: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the motion will not prevail.

Mr. ROUNDS: The gentleman has said that we have no inebriates in Cumberland county. I think why the inebriates were not sent there was because we had so much probation that everybody who got full in Cumberland county was put on probation. Therefore the farm was of no use. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. WARREN of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought before the Cumberland county delegation and laid on the table. As I remember, it was simply a question of whether we would give the county commissioners of the county of Cumberland the authority to lease or to lease and sell. There is no question but we could give them authority to lease, and the matter was held over, and it does not seem as though we are any nearer to solution of it. I do not think it ought to be indefinitely postponed. I do not see any special benefit in having it laid on the table. It is simply a question, as I remember it, of whether we should give them the full authority to lease or to sell or limit them to the authority to lease.

Mr. HINCKLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know of no prospect of leasing property such as that. If the county has no further use for it it should be sold, and that is the reason I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, before the judiciary committee at the present time there is a bill to set up a State reformatory for men. Under the laws and statutes of today if a boy 16 years old or over is brought before the court for having committed a felony, there is no place in Maine where he can lay his head for the next four years, if the sentence is going to be for four years, except the State prison at Thomaston. For the State prison at Thomaston every decent man in Maine blushes whenever it is mentioned. For

the placing in any state prison anywhere of a 16-year-old boy or a 17-year-old boy or a 20-year-old boy, any right-minded man quails when that sentence is brought up before him. Now it happens that the State of Maine has not a great sum of money. If it had, I would suggest that we have a State prison for which we would not have to blush. We need not attempt to make it a summer resort for our friends, but rather make it such that if we sent a man there he would not need to die of tuberculosis or be taken out afflicted with tuberculosis when his term expired. If we had a sufficient sum of money we would certainly set up a reformatory for men. If there was a possible place for the boy to go we would send him to the State School for Boys. If he is caught in what appears to be a crime, and the jury finds it to be a crime or a felony, there is no chance for him except the toboggan that leads to hell. I know boys, and my heart is big enough to think twice when a thing of this sort is up. Save the boys! Give them a chance! It is suggested before this Legislature—and I have to apologize as one of the judiciary committee that it has not come in before you in concrete form—it is suggested before this Legislature that the State start saving the 16-year-olds. They are not like horses at 16, ready to be shot, poled with an axe or given chloroform; though either one of these would be better than sending them to the State's prison at Thomaston. You do not know but that if not your own sons, your cousin's sons, when coming out of the woods sometime hungry may kick in the door of a sporting camp and may get sentence to State's prison therefor, as I saw an eminent justice of the supreme court sentence two boys for a year for breaking into a camp in the wilderness. How do we meet this in our penury and poverty. We suggest that the State set up a State reformatory in a bill that will be presented here in a day or two where we can put the 16-year-old boys. The State cannot go out and buy. Cumberland county has this splendid farm. The situation is grand if the truth has been told about it, and possibly the State for a couple of years

might either hire it of Cumberland county or purchase it for such a reformatory for boys before these 16-year-old boys become old men and gray haired. I hope that this will not be postponed indefinitely, and, truth to tell, I hope it will be passed. It does not bind Cumberland county to anything. That county can either sell it or lease it. No harm can come from the passage of this bill. It is none of my business except that I am a citizen of the State of Maine, and I prize very highly this young stock of ours between 16 and 21.

Mr. ALDEN of Gorham: Mr. Speaker, I think it was only four years ago that Cumberland county bought this valuable farm. It is a fine piece of property. It is a pretty short time to come up here and say we will sell it or lease it. Leasing it would be all right, but to sell it, I think it is a wrong thing to do at this particular time. As the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Barnes) says the State may want it, and if you go and sell it under price, we cannot get it then. I hope the farm will be held over there in Cumberland county. We are not so poor that we have got to sell or lease it right away. I hope the county will hold on to it for awhile. As I understand the gentleman from Houlton (Mr. Barnes) the State cannot do anything for two years, and if they cannot we had better be sure and hold it.

Mr. BARNES of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, I must have been seriously misapprehended. It is said that the State will be in a position so that it could hire this plant, and it is said that it is large and commodious enough so it could take care of a good many boys. May I inquire of the gentleman from Gorham (Mr. Alden) through the Chair whether there is serious objection to authorizing the county commissioners—not ordering them, but authorizing them, if in their judgement it is good business, to lease or sell? Is there any serious objection to that?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Gorham, Mr. Alden, may reply through the Chair.

Mr. ALDEN: I think we started to amend the bill and somebody has failed to do it; and, Mr. Speaker, I think we had better not give them a chance to sell it. I move that the bill be laid on the table until there is a chance to amend it.

The SPEAKER: The motion to lay on the table takes precedence.

A viva voce vote being taken the bill was tabled.

The Chair lays before the House, Senate Document No. 16, majority report, ought to pass, minority report, ought not to pass, on bill, An Act granting women the right to vote for presidential electors, tabled by Mr. Maher of Augusta, pending acceptance of either report. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman upon whose motion this was placed on the table, he wishes to state the situation to the House so that they may understand what is before them. Two reports come in; majority report, signed by eight members, ought to pass; and the minority report signed by two members, ought not to pass. In the Senate the bill was passed to be engrossed without amendments, and comes to the House with two Senate amendments attached, both of which were rejected in the Senate, but they come before the House and can be acted upon, and should properly be acted upon by the House either by adoption or by rejection; and without reading the amendments in detail, unless somebody requests it, the Chair will state that Senate Amendment B to Senate Amendment A provides that the bill be referred to a special election to be held next September. Senate Amendment A provides that a special election be held on the bill at the regular State election in 1920.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, In order to get the proper parliamentary status, I move the acceptance of the majority report, and state that I do that, intending to address myself to what I consider the real subject matter in controversy.

Thereupon the House voted to accept the majority report, ought to pass, and the bill received its first reading.

The SPEAKER: This brings the

matter up to the Senate amendment, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Maher.

Mr. MAHER of Augusta: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, to me there appeals at this time as in any other proposed legislation the first and natural query—just what is sought—just what will result—not merely what is said—not the excuse, the extenuation, the subterfuge, but the heart of the thing—the real objective end. In plain words—what does this proposition mean?

Now I am neither so innocent nor so stupid as to accept or believe that this means settlement of the suffrage question.

My observation of the natural operations of men seeking a definite goal, is, that failing to reach that goal in one way they not infrequently attempt by change of tactics to effect their purpose. In other words upon failure of a frontal attack, the forces are rallied and what should have been decisive is put again in issue by a flank movement. Precisely the situation now—under the guise of appointing presidential electors—we are urged to adopt a course which must beget a sharp and bitter contest.

To confer on women the right to choose the chief executive of this mighty republic with it hundred million inhabitants—and to refuse to permit them to select a representative in this body or a first selectman of some town appeals to me as not only inconsistency—but rank absurdity.

This measure, call it what you will, veil it as you may concede as a compromise or disguise by sophistry—means the first definite step that will never halt this side of full, complete and equal suffrage.

Do you think for an instant that given the choice in the mighty contest for a President of the United States that the women politicians won't see to it that both political parties in that practical eagerness for votes, when votes count, won't be bound, committed, riveted to a pledge for full suffrage?

That premise no man whose opinion counts can successfully refute. If he

attempts it I invite attention to his now recorded words as the years roll on.

Now what is your duty and mine? I submit that under a representative form of government such as we enjoy we are bound, first to ascertain the mind of our electorate whose mouthpiece we are, and not to experiment; second to reflect with as much exactitude as we can that opinion—not to ignore same; third, to translate that opinion into positive enactments. So that we shall really and truly function as representatives of the people and not by individual caprice, personal expediency, party timidity or plain temerity through evasion and subterfuge seek to avoid the clear, positive, direct, unmistakable mandate of the people.

Is the opinion of the electorate known? Manifestly known of all men. After 10 years of agitation this question in essence was submitted by the last Legislature to the voters of Maine and on the 10th of September, 1917, 20,000 voters of Maine were recorded for suffrage and 38,000 against it.

To people who urge the vote for woman on the premise of majority rule, I submit we are in possession of the expressed opinion of 38,000 voters as against, and a pitiful minority of 20,000 in favor.

We are then not in doubt as to the opinion of our electorate.

Does this proposition reflect that opinion? Certainly not! If it does not reflect that it rebukes that opinion. And it rebukes that opinion either directly or indirectly. I care not which, whether in the open, beheld and seen of all men, or by evasion, compromise and subterfuge. This measure is manifestly not a recording by legislative enactment of that opinion. It surely is not a translating into act of the mind of the men who sent us here.

To disregard the expressed will of the people can only be justified by some compelling necessity or exigency.

In this juncture analysis and examination of the main question becomes inevitable. Is there an impelling need expressed by an imperative exigency for a fundamental change in the electorate of Maine?

First, is there the impelling need? If

so, what is it? Not inherent personal right, not inalienable political right—but simple, practical expediency is the test.

The burden of proof in this grave matter rests upon the proponents, and that burden calls for definite, determinative and controlling proof. We are not a debating society for academic discussion, nor an incubating device for begetting experimental legislation.

To pass intelligently upon this momentous matter requires at least a casual examination of the subject matter. To do less than this is to prove recreant to our plain duty, to refuse to do so is to afford strong evidence of our own willingness to personally contribute to the disrepute of representative government.

What are the reasons for this drastic change? What is the real argument for equal suffrage?

The arguments are twofold—

First—Idealistic or theoretical.

Second—Practical.

Of the former we hear much of justice, equality, right—but this generality is a two-edged sword and until woman with substantial majority shall show the will of her own sex, no group has any monopoly on justice and right as against the woman who denies the right and equity of another group to impose the artificial burdens of ballot to her natural burdens of life.

The practical arguments advanced in support of this great change are—that it will benefit the State by an improvement of politics and give us better measures and better men.

I think I state the matter fairly, accurately, honestly. Now will it give us better measures? Pray what is there concrete in the matter of legislation or constructive policy in the State of Maine that supporters of woman's suffrage can put their finger on and say "This measure is desired—that policy is desirable and the votes of women are essential to the successful solution thereof."

Has Maine been laggard in the matter of progressive legislation?

Was Maine quiescent when the progressive sentiment of this country demanded a primary law? We were

one of the first States of the East to embark on this method of choice of candidates upon the assumption that bosses and cliques and coterjes would bow before the plain mandate of the voter.

Were we laggard in Maine when there was submitted and overwhelmingly adopted the basic change in our constitution by way of initiative and referendum amendment, allowing the initiation of legislation upon petition by the people and compelling the reference to the people of any legislative acts when a sufficient number indicated by petition their desire therefor?

Have we been laggard with reference to the creation of wise and progressive educational reforms, health laws and statutes numerous and drastic for moral uplift?

Was Maine a laggard in law when she set the pace which has just culminated in nation-wide adoption as to the prohibition of traffic in intoxicating liquor?

Has Maine been recreant to the interests of women in the matter of law with reference to her property rights, her freedom to sue and be sued; to deal with her property acquired by inheritance or earning free from restraint equal with men?

Has Maine ever been charged by any man or woman with undue severity to women in the matter of marital rights or the divorce law in the severance thereof?

Man is compelled by just and humane statutes in his property and now in his person to full and fair support of his wife and offspring. Woman has that full and absolute legal status with man plus very superior advantages.

Has Maine been in any way slothful in the matter of labor laws? The limiting of hours of employment; in the prohibiting of child labor; the providing of comfort and conveniences of women employees of factories?

By the repeal of the harsh features of the Trustee Law; by the limiting of the hours of labor of women and children and by the far-reaching arm of the law and the equity as to non-

support and judicial separation, and Maine is one of the first states in the Union that has authorized woman by statute to bring action against another woman who invades the sanctity of her home.

Venturesome and imaginative indeed is that man or woman who says that wise and progressive legislation attends or depends on the ballot for woman.

Will we get better men in office? Pray when and where do we draw the line?

Will we get better Governors than Chamberlain, Selden Connor, William T. Cobb, and Carl E. Milliken?

Does democracy suggest that the people of Maine erred in the selection of Harris M. Plaisted as Governor, or in this later day the selection of his distinguished son, Frederick W. Plaisted?

Does the Warwick of the Democratic Party who now champions suffrage find fault with the people of Maine for their selection of Oakley C. Curtis as Chief Executive of this State?

Does the distinguished editor of the Kennebec Journal think that the people of the State of Maine could have made a wiser choice for Governor and Congressman of the Third District and for senator in the United States Senate than they did when they chose that man whose memory we all honor, the late Edwin C. Burleigh?

Again does the present actual head of the Democratic party in Maine, who is now collaborating with the distinguished editor of the Kennebec Journal for woman's suffrage, find fault with the choice of the people of Maine when they sent him first as Republican legislator from Machias to the Maine House and then chose him as a Democratic legislator from the city of Waterville, and made him three times mayor of Waterville and then attorney general of this State, or did the people of Augusta err when they chose the Honorable Lewis A. Burleigh, whose learning and integrity every man admits, to represent them in this House and would have continued to send him until now had he so desired.

Is there any gentleman of this House forsooth so modest as to feel that his neighbors made an error of judgment September last when they selected him to express their views.

Better men and better measures! I'll trust the old way and the old measures as against a movement which burns in Lafayette Square the speech of the President of these United States and then goes to the dastardly limit of burning in effigy the Chief Magistrate of this nation upon his return from a triumphal reception by the successful peoples of the Old World.

Methinks I see the coy, blandishments of the erstwhile emissary of this woman's movement as she tripped along yonder corridor interviewing the members of this House in behalf of the sacred cause, and moves from here to wider fields and on historic Boston Common allows her enthusiasm and exuberance to reach the stage that heartless police officers deem a joy ride in a patrol wagon essential for the preservation of Boston's peace. (Applause.)

The arguments by way of refutation which have hitherto been advanced, and which the logician would call negative proof would to my mind seem controlling, but when buttressed by the direct and positive proof against this bill, seems overwhelming.

First, what is the real test of democracy in a representative government? Manifestly the answer is a ready and true reflex of the opinion of the people and their judgment by their duly authorized and accredited representatives. In other words "vox populi, vox dei est."

Anything which obscures, confuses or retards that governmental process—to the extent of the confusing, is an interference with the true functioning of a representative government.

And if this measure, weighed by that test is more calculated to produce uncertainty as to the majority will, its adoption can only be justified by some compelling argument of necessity.

Will it tend to a clarification or a confusion of the true public opinion of the majority?



Women given the ballot will either vote or not vote. If they do not vote with the same relative strength as men now do, you have simply added a great potential electorate, whose will is ever in doubt, whose judgment is not expressed and who will exercise their privilege solely on the occasion of some great stress, when under emotional influence of the hour, they may well be the determining factor against settled policies—which represent the slow growth of true progress through generations of experience.

On the other hand if they do vote with a relativity equal to man—they will vote either in accord with their male environment or in discord.

If in discord, heaven avert the day! for the ties of the domestic unit are already tightened enough, the home is not inviting additional strain and if they substantially vote in accord with their males, you have doubled the units of the electorate and in fact trebled and quadrupled the power of the practical politician. That man who with pencil now traces the check list to diagnose Thomas, Joseph or John will add a new element to the equation—what can Thomas, Joseph or John do with Mary, Susan or Kate? My friends, you are begetting a new type of male politician in our cities, he might be dubbed the dance hall diplomat!

To crystallize in a sentence, this measure appeals to me as ill-advised because it will add one more serious burden to the already **strained efficiency of popular government**.

Arguments in support of this premise naturally group themselves into two classes—

First: The idealistic or theoretic-al.

Second: The practical.

Idealistic or theoretical arguments are compelling or not as dependent upon the prejudgment or prejudice of the hearer. They are necessarily drawn from generalizations, and being generalizations may or may not be sound.

Of arguments of this type is the familiar one of loss of true status, and notwithstanding the frequency of

use of this argument until it has become in a sense hackneyed, and despite the weakening of the true force of the argument by its sometimes intemperate statement, there does to me appeal much of force therein.

The conferring of the privilege of suffrage entails its use, its intelligent, its enthusiastic use. Any other consequence would be mere idle diluting of the electorate. Its full use means full, vigorous participation, in the battles of peace, means that intense partisanship which is an American characteristic, and which I may confidently add is an attribute to which woman is peculiarly prone. It means differences of opinion and emphatic statement thereof. It means the line up, the canvass and the count, and the pitiless light of criticism and impudent comment of motives.

Immediately there follows the argument that the will of any majority is ever dependent upon the power to enforce its decrees. The sanction of all law is finally dependent upon this power to enforce it, and we respectfully submit that a majority decision of an electorate unable in the last analysis to enforce its will except by hunger strikes or sex repression does not appeal to me as an instance of particularly vigorous, effective, practical or permanent democracy.

It is an elementary law in the natural order that forces work along the line of least resistance—this is equally true in the political order. There is and must ever be the sharp and distinctive difference between man and woman, of sex. Political issues and preferment are matters dependent for wise and right determination upon mind and will. The attempted grouping into an harmonious whole of an electorate with a basic fundamental and eternal difference between two great groups will of the very necessities of the artificial arrangement either be fatuous and futile of results, or it will beget sex antagonism, disturbing, disruptive and destructive of the true equilibrium of citizenship!

That is a fact immutable and eternal. And man cannot justify ignoring

of the same by the thin veil of platitudes, nor by sentiment obscure, nor by craven coddling for personal power seek to warrant.

There arise situations for the legislator to determine more impelling than personal fortunes and more compelling than party caprice. To me this is such a juncture. But think not that the sole reason against this fundamental departure depends upon generalities. I can see very practical objections that should appeal to practical men.

In the first place it is not consonant with nor in furtherance of democracy under a representative form of government like ours. And the reason for that is obvious. The further you get from the mind and the will of the people the further you depart from democracy and get misrepresentative, instead of representative government.

The adding of this great group to the electorate of Maine, not merely doubles but multiplies the difficulties of obtaining an honest, impartial expression of public opinion.

But there remains a great mass of the womanhood of Maine—the girl who is grappling with the stern realities of business and industrial life and the quiet, silent army of home governors embraced in that dearest of descriptives the “home bodies”—this group in my judgment overwhelming in its numerical superiority to the combined suffrage and anti-suffrage partisans have not that interest which impels them to either oppose or ask this legislation. To force upon the unwilling and the unasking the duties of citizenship at the behest of a small, but vociferous, minority, is unwise, unnecessary and unjust. Until there is that substantial unanimity among women essential to harmony and efficiency, the formula of self-determination should forbid the forsaking of old ways for new. Novelty is not a prime requisite of legislation and change is not always progress.

Another argument is immediately suggested that forces the conclusion that this would be a step away from,

and not in harmony with, representative government. Any law for its force or salutary working must be adapted not only to the natural needs, but the natural convenience of the people affected. In other words the geographical conditions of any state play a very important and very frequently a determining part in the policies of legislation.

Maine is, and will for all time be, an essentially agricultural state. Maine must, from the very nature of things, be for decades a state of magnificent distances. It is of vital and not theoretical importance that this great backbone of life in our state be adequately voiced and accurately heard. Any measure if manifestly calculated to give a disproportionate power to the cities as against the rural communities of Maine I apprehend if rightly understood, would get scanty support in this legislature. And this would rightly be so because, in this state beloved of the pine tree, its granite heart is our glory and its rural life our wealth!

But I earnestly, sincerely urge upon your thoughtful attention as serious men, this proposition that this measure, if adopted, will give in its practical and actual operation a vastly disproportionate power to the cities and populous communities as against the smaller towns and the country sections of Maine. Let us not theorize—let us not speculate—let us not guess—Pray give heed to cold, hard facts. The latest census report has illuminating and eloquent testimony upon this all important—I might even with propriety say—vital phase of this question.

Maine has 429 towns, 348 townships and 81 plantations and Maine has 20 cities. Now the 20 cities and 35 larger towns, representing the urban, or city population of Maine had a total population in 1890 of 298,604 as against a rural population of 362,482. In other words there were 64,000 more people on the farms in 1890 than there were in the cities. In 1900, ten years later, there were 337,390 people in the cities as against 357,076 on the farms, still 20,070 more in the country than in the city.

Significant and in a way alarming does the last census show the shifting of balance—360,928 in the country—381,443 in the cities—20,000 more in those same cities than in the country.

In 20 years a balance of population of 64,000 more in the country than in the cities of Maine is shifted until there are 20,000 more in the cities than on the farms.

How do we find the division of the sexes?

There are 377,052 males in Maine to 365,319 females—a ratio of 103.2 men to women.

In the cities we find 189,166 men to 192,277 women—98.4 men to women.

In the country 187,886 men to 173,042 women—108.6 men to women.

Are you men of rural Maine going, by your votes on this measure, to stifle further expression of your communities—do you want to make it harder for the natural sentiment of your state to express and obtain its natural rights?

Further and as a practical argument which no man can deny, it is easier by far because of obvious reasons—of comfort—convenience—accessibility—easily aroused interest and quick working organization to get out and poll the city vote as against the country vote.

Manifestly and indisputably easier to get out and poll the women voters of the cities and industrial centers—than in the country with distance—difficulties and natural indifference. Gentlemen, not in theory, but in cold, calm consideration of facts let us deal. I say and challenge successful refutation that Maine from natural conditions, geography and environment should never vote this measure until there comes a clear, calm call from the women of rural Maine and not from the conservatory so-called society and salon—faddist of the passing moment.

We are further, gentlemen of the House, bound to test this measure in its practical application and workings by existing laws and procedure thereunder. Again we must urge that you should discard theory and dismiss generalities and glib appeals to so-

called sentiment. We are impressed with one situation in this state which should be an absolutely and controlling factor in directing an adverse judgment. We see not a fanciful objection, but a very real and substantial reason against the same. We are not ambitious of ridicule, and when we say that this situation we are about to cite has in it much of menace fundamentally grave and imminently dangerous elements, we are conservative and not indulging in alarmist cries: What do we mean?

There is now in this State a law you are familiar with, known as the direct primary.

I care not what your personal bias as to that particular law is. I venture that few men and no political parties are ambitious to oppose it in public. I further venture that this law will outlive most of the members of this House.

What is the tendency in practical working under this law? How will that tendency be affected by doubling the electorate?

Every man within the sound of my voice knows that every advantage in the world is with the candidate from the city. That the natural, usual, inevitable result is a marked tendency for the cities to control the primary vote. Does any man doubt that? Let him recall his county ticket in the last campaign! Does he still doubt? Come to the end of vonder corridor and survey the Senate in session. Twenty of the thirty-one members of the upper branch of this legislature—in theory representing the counties, as senators in the U. S. represent the state—are from the larger towns of the state. Have we a rural congressman or a rural senator. Why, gentlemen, even as ardent a suffrage supporter as our distinguished and respected governor, appreciated the force of this tendency and took up a voting residence in Augusta.

What will be the unescapable result in practice of a doubling of the electorate and augmenting the power of industrial and commercial centers where there is every inducement of interest and convenience to bring out the vote—male and female.

Your city woman can trip along the granolithic sidewalk or call

a taxi to take her from her club or social function to the polls—the woman of your smaller community and the strictly rural vote will be patriots indeed if they show a greater activity than their men folk in voting—and you all know that the real problem today is to get out the country vote. How many worries in Maine have been given to the thought of a stormy Monday!

My friends, you are solemnly closing the doors of hope to the ambitious, intellectual, able young man politically ambitious but geographically ill-placed.

I have no selfish interest—I am city born and bred—my every taste and tendency is urban—but I think there are things bigger and better and broader than self, and among such the best interest of the best state I know, and above, beyond and over all I think that representative government in days like these demands, as it depends upon representative men, that no selfish interests, no select section—no grasping group—but that every section and all the people, all the time, be equally voiced!

Another practical objection of very great weight arises from the fundamental law of our State—from one of our constitutional amendments—and gentlemen will note that I am not so silly as to be diverted into discussing simply the question of choice of presidential electors. When you pass this law you are committed in the inexorable logic of events to full suffrage. Every sane man knows that and if he is candid admits it.

The initiative and referendum provision of our constitution permits the initiation of laws by petition of 12,000 signers and compels the reference of laws upon petition of 10,000. This number is adequate with the present electorate. I submit that doubling that electorate before a change in the constitution in this regard and we will by indirection have produced a state of affairs far different than was anticipated when the amendment was adopted.

Again a practical objection occurs in the matter of poll taxes. Shall we adhere to the male test in this regard—

taxing every man of 21—alien or naturalized—vote or not, and put the ballot into woman's hands and not the burden?

It would appeal to me as the part of wisdom to tax—if the woman is to have that full equality some are so fond of asserting. Shall we tax non-voting women? Shall we tax the non-earning housewife? Putting a double burden on the wage-earning husband? You won't put a poll tax on women at all, I confidently venture—and we behold the strangest anomaly in free government—the non-voting alien and the voting man carrying this tax burden—while the voting woman simply says what will be done with the proceeds of the tax.

Another practical objection—women should not be given the ballot until our naturalization laws are changed. An alien man has now to run the gamut of closest scrutiny by government agents and the courts—has to declare formally in the courts his intention of becoming a citizen—wait the allotted period and go into court with two citizens and be tested as to his fitness, eligibility and desirability—before his vote can be given against yours. But an alien woman becomes a citizen by marriage to a citizen that instant and under this bill if she has been in this country five years can vote. Do you believe in that? If you do, vote for it, but do it understandingly.

The chief dangers of any democracy are violent extremes—those extremes which result from hasty, ill-considered, unadvised action. To me this new element resulting from a double electorate is potential of this very condition.

And in days like these when the very air is charged with strife—when we behold the tumult and the chaos that is worldwide, when nothing seems certain but uncertainty—and the truest truth is doubt, shall we by our solemn act add one more and one more great factor to that seething maelstrom of unrest in our own great State?

When above, beyond and over all the thing that is most needed is calm, cool, sober counsel and quiet, even, steady act, shall we in that excess of confidence in our own wisdom take it upon ourselves to make the most momentous

departure since Maine became a State?

And that brings me gentleman, to the crux as it is the close of the case.

I am not going to urge or ask you to vote against woman's suffrage. I have given you what seemed to me a few of the grave reasons against its expediency. It certainly is an issue which admits of honest difference of opinion. I am, however, going to ask you, going to confine you, going to appeal to you for that even-handed justice men call the square deal, and I ask it in behalf of the men whose voice you now are and whose votes you sought in September last.

I heard the greatest Democrat in Maine, of this generation, say in this very house, standing, I think, in this very spot, and by peculiar coincidence he happens now to be the chief authority as he is the real brains of the suffrage movement in this State—William R. Pattangall—that three things existing relative to law its submission to the people was imperative—first, that there was inherently nothing wrong about the measure; second, that valid doubt as to its approval existed; third, that a genuine demand for its submission existed among the people.

Assuredly there is doubt whether the voters of Maine approve now of this measure when they so emphatically disapproved of the main proposition.

If you still believe in the doctrine of majority rule the demand exists for the voters to approve or disapprove this law.

And the verdict of the voters having been overwhelmingly against equal suffrage by constitutional change I ask you in their behalf to give them simply the chance to pass upon this by-product—this evasion—this back-stair attempt to circumvent a solemn decision of the people.

Gentlemen of the House, when the last Legislature adjourned it had said: Men of Maine what is your will on equal suffrage? The answer was overwhelmingly against.

There was waged a political campaign in September last—one of the results of which is you and I are here with duties to perform.

Prior to that campaign there was a

State convention in Portland—not thinly attended—but the greatest popular convention in years. There was attempted as you know to insert a plank in the platform for suffrage. The attempt failed—the issue was considered settled—for one campaign at least. They had their day in court and lost.

Suffrage was not an issue in the last election.

We are here instructed by our constituency by its vote on suffrage. It is not merely venturesome—not simply daring—but plainly impudent to demand that we disregard that vote.

What man among us would dare thwart the will of Maine on any other vital issue? What magic or necessary changes the attitude on this seductive subject?

Gentlemen, let us with that calm which comports with character meet this question with candor, consideration and courage.

Let us say here and now we will not assume or presume to take this on faith which Scripture defines as "the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of which appears not."

Let us, refusing to be cajoled by flattery or confused by the cross-currents of criticism, so act that no free man can question and no fair woman complain.

Gentlemen, I don't ask any man to be bound by the vote at the special election as held, but I do ask every man in order that orderly government shall not seem a mockery, that you do not disregard that vote. And while not bound by that vote you pass this measure yet out of regard for that vote you accept a referendum amendment.

Gentlemen, one further thought appeals to me—perhaps it will to you. When the President of these United States asked Congress to declare existing a state of war and thus gave answer to the impudent challenge of Germany, and this nation willed that henceforth it should be known of all men that the blood of a peasant was as good as the blood of a prince and that no government whatever its exigency could wantonly shed the

blood of an American free man without instantly answering to every American freeman, here in Maine we felt the thrill and throb of eternal issues—and from our sea-washed head lands and our cloud-swept highlands and sun-kissed lowlands there sprang a valiant host of the best there was among you—these lads went over the salt partitions of ocean to the fields of France, and Flanders and Belgium and Germany that this State as they knew it and as you know it, might continue. Some of these boys are now coming home—I want those boys to have the chance as they have, God knows, earned the right to a voice and a vote on this issue.

In behalf of the great womanhood of Maine opposed to suffrage—

In behalf of the vast disinterested and unasking women of Maine—

In behalf of the 38,000 men of Maine who voted "No" on September 10, 1917—

In behalf of simple justice and a fair, square deal I appeal for a chance for the voters to say what their will is—and then let that will be done. (Prolonged applause).

Mr. BAXTER of Portland: Mr. Speaker, such brief remarks as I shall address to the members of this House will be based solely upon my convictions; and it is on that ground that I appeal to the members of this House to support this equal suffrage measure. Having definite, positive conviction, as I have, upon this important question, and knowing that many members of this House have equally definite and positive convictions, I realize that no amount of logic, eloquence or argument, and no questions of expediency, can change our opinions. Those of us who believe in suffrage believe that women have just as much right to vote as men, and that the duty to assume their full and complete share in our government rests upon them just as strongly as it does upon men. There are many men in this House who have definite and positive convictions against woman's suffrage, and I cannot hope to move them by my arguments. It is useless to argue long on a question of

this sort, with which we are all so familiar, and the only ground on which I can appeal to you, gentlemen, is to appeal to your sense of justice and your sense of fair play. It seems to me that the issue is clear-cut and well defined, and that the objections which the gentlemen who oppose this measure make are made to confuse and to delay a decision upon this question. Our shoulders, gentlemen, are broad. We are sent here as representatives of those at home, but I cannot escape the argument that, even though we may come from communities in this State that are opposed to woman's suffrage, if any of us have strong, firm convictions in favor of it our convictions must govern our actions. If it were not so we would be placed in the unfortunate position of voting against our convictions and simply registering the wishes of those who sent us here. On questions of this sort I prefer to stand upon my convictions, and if my constituency disapproves of my action I must submit to such punishment as they may see fit to give me in the years to come.

Now the men and women of Maine who have borne the burden of this fight for many years are earnest, loyal men and women who believe just this, that one-half of the adult population of the State of Maine should not be deprived of the right of self-government. No matter how many arguments may be presented to you, it comes right down to that basic principle. There are always those who oppose progress. There are always those who prefer to keep things as they are rather than to push ahead and seek for better things in the future. Why, gentlemen of the House, it is only 56 years ago—a brief space of time—that there were men in this country—thousands and perhaps millions of them—who honestly believed that the black man should not be freed. Such a state of mind is unbelievable today. There are many men in this country, and especially in European countries, who today believe that manhood suffrage is a dangerous experiment. Such people are fearful of extending human rights, but, gentlemen, they are bound to be left behind in the progress of the human race. It is

absolutely inevitable that women will be admitted on equal terms with men, no human being will much longer be denied full and complete citizenship on account of sex alone. When I think of the part played by the women of this country, and by the women of Maine during the recent war, and when I think of the sacrifices many of them made, and of the far greater sacrifices many of them—in fact, all of them—were prepared to make in order that the highest ideals of this country might endure—when I think of those things, I should think and expect that every man would welcome woman in full and equal partnership in the affairs of government. It is only in that manner that we can express our real and sincere appreciation and our absolute confidence in them.

The gentleman who preceded me, and to whose eloquent remarks I listened in rapt attention, made the statement that this was but an entering wedge, and those of us who favor this bill accept the challenge with all that it implies. This is but the first step, gentlemen, toward the complete emancipation of the women of this State. When you vote upon this question bear that in mind. We do not seek to confuse the issue or in any way belittle it in your minds. If you believe that woman is entitled to a place by the side of man, in fair weather or in foul, and whether the path to be trod together be one of roses or of thistles, vote today according to your convictions. Give women such suffrage as is in your power here today to give them. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the amendment will not prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. MAHER: Mr. Speaker, my attention is called to the fact that I did not make a motion. I thought I had. I wish to move, Mr. Speaker, that amendment B be adopted. I wish, just for a minute, if I may, to refer to the convincing and eloquent arguments of my esteemed friend, the representative from Portland (Mr. Baxter). He is mistaken. I said nothing about any entering wedge. I expressly anticipated it by saying that without doubt that this was a definite, deliberate step that would never stop. He stated at the outset,

or very near the outset, that it was a matter of deep conviction, and then, as he moved on in his remarks he stated that it was inevitable. I fear his deep conviction results from his opinion that it is inevitable. But, gentlemen, with reference to the very discourteous thought he expressed which I, as an opponent of suffrage, shall resent—when he attempted to compare the womanhood of Maine, per argument, with the black man of the south—as an opponent of this measure, I resent it. (Applause.) I will call the gentleman's attention to this—with his wide learning and extensive observation, has he ever known, or does any man know, of any group of men who ever, anywhere under the sun, resented or refused participation upon their own part in the affairs of the government. When Lord John Russell urged universal suffrage for Englishmen, did you find his reform bill opposed by Englishmen—objecting to this privilege for an Englishman? When Daniel O'Connell thundered at Parliament for the same right for Irishmen—was there any protest from the proposed participants? When the founders of this government of ours were seeking to bring order from chaos and give to the world what we hope is an eternal chart of freedom—do you learn that there was any anti-suffrage societies among the men?

Why, I have heard of Daughters of the American Revolution of Colonial Dames and Colonial Sons, but I have yet to see the genealogical records cumbered by any account of descendants of colonial remonstrants against their right to take part in the affairs of government. You have the anomaly here, sir, which you cannot escape, of an American unit, certainly of equal probity, surely as influential, fully as disinterested, and I am going to say numerically equal, to the ladies who want suffrage, who are remonstrating against it, and that is the fallacy that should be answered.

Mr. HINCKLEY of South Portland: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but I feel it is only proper, and my duty, to say a word. I shall be very brief. If I felt my duty toward the ladies, as some

men apparently do, the past week I would have paid a bachelor's income tax.

It is true that the women are not on a parity with the black men of the south. It is nevertheless true that the conditions of master and slave between men and women exists in the state of Maine today (applause) and it is only a question of degree. The chief sat in his wigwam and smoked his pipe, and the women tilled the soil and harvested the corn; and between that condition and the condition in this state today it is mostly a question of degree. The gentleman from Augusta (Mr. Maher) reviewed to some extent the legislation in the state of Maine, and he pointed with pride to the fact that we had given woman the right to own property. I say, men, when you speak of the inherent right, and when you speak of the natural right, and when you argue that this is only a privilege that is being discussed today—that a woman has just as natural and just as inherent a right to vote in the State of Maine today as man has (Applause.) The only reason, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, that men have the right to vote and have that natural and inherent right, is because they were strong enough to take it, and for no other reason; and they have assumed that right from generation to generation, from the old dark ages. It was not many years ago that in this same house a distinguished gentleman, a member of this legislature, stood on this floor and argued that women had not, and should not have, the right to hold property in her own name, because somebody might get it away from her. We have progressed to some extent. The only reason, men, that the gentlemen from Augusta (Mr. Maher) has a right to vote today, or any of us have a right to vote, is that man gave it to him, and the only reason that woman has not the right to vote is that man has prevented her from exercising that right. There cannot be any other argument. There cannot be any other reason. It makes no difference whether woman is as intelligent as man or not. It makes no difference whether she is as well educated along political lines

as man or not. It makes no difference whether she would vote as her husband, or her father, or her son would vote, or not. It makes no difference how she will vote. We do know that in all the great moral and social questions woman is nearer right by intuition than man is by education, and she will be safe in those questions anyway. I say to you again that we have no right to assume this thing; that we have no right to assume our superiority; and I say again, Mr. Speaker, I do not give a rap what anybody in the State of Maine believes about this question. I say that men have no right to vote today more than women, except that right which they have delegated to themselves; and I say that the sooner men get out of this narrow, selfish business, which we cusses have accepted through the past ages, the better it will be for our country. It is narrowness; it is usurping a right which man has taken upon himself, and nothing more nor less. I realize fully that I am talking against precedent. I realize perhaps, as a fact, that many men are opposed to this thing; but why are they opposed to it? I have never heard any argument against woman's suffrage, and there is no argument against it. There cannot be any argument against it. Let us give, as a matter or right, and I repeat, her inherent right, because if men have the inherent right to vote and control the affairs of this state and this country, women have just the same right; and let us take away that last vestige of a condition of slavery which women have been held in, and give them the right to enact laws the same as men have it. I say further than this, I do not care how the women feel about this question; it does not make any difference to me. Woman has gone into every professional life in the State of Maine and in this country. Woman has entered every office and every line of business, and when she does that, I say it is her duty to assume the responsibility, and I have no toleration with the woman who says she will not do that. It is her duty, and I say that



on these matters, women should take the responsibility and should bear the same burdens in these matters as the men. (Applause)

Mr. BERRY of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up a minute of the time of this House today, until the last speaker arose to his feet. I think it but fair now to add a word. As I understand, the question we are considering at this time is the amendment, whether it shall be referred to the people or not. It was my pleasure to stand in the rear of this hall, seat 131, two years ago, and state my reasons why I was opposed to equal suffrage—why I did not want it referred to the people. I was voted down and it was referred to the people; perhaps justly. The only question I am going to ask you members of this House is, why the change? Why is it that two years ago, when this matter came up, that some of you who were members of this House then, pleaded to refer it to the people? and today you come in here with a substitute bill granting women the right to vote for Presidential electors? I cannot understand your attitude. My city, which I have the honor to represent, voted and voted intelligently, or voted as they saw fit, and I would not go home—representative government or not—to my people, and go against their wishes of so recent a date on this question. I think, gentlemen, it is a matter which you should take to yourselves, whether you will set up a democratic government of yourselves, if you please, because you are elected by your constituency, or vote according to their wishes. I was surprised to hear the gentleman from South Portland (Mr. Hinckley) make the statement which I thought I did, as to his attitude on this bill. Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, if I believed in suffrage, or equal suffrage, if you please, and this question came to a vote, I would arise and address the Speaker and state my personal stand, and then I would back that constituency at home. I do not believe in the strangle grip.

Mr. FORBES of South Paris: Mr. Speaker, I want to tire the House for

a few minutes, even though the hour is so late, for the purpose of stating my own position on this matter. I want to say at the outset that I do not for a moment consider any question of inherent or intrinsic right to ballot. The extension of suffrage must be based, as has been said, upon cold, hard, common sense opinions. Now I expect the day to come when the women of Maine, and the women of the rest of the country, will have suffrage; and because I held that expectation, I voted for the suffrage amendment in September, 1917. I did so with misgivings as to whether the women really desired the ballot; whether if it was given to them, they would feel the sense of their duties and responsibilities; in short, the matter that troubled me was, did the women want the ballot? If it was given to them, would they use it? I held no preconceived notion. I admit that I cannot see why a woman may not vote and exercise her influence in political affairs and still be a woman; just as womanly as she is when exercising her charms in wheedling money out of patrons of a church fair. I am going to vote against both the amendment and the bill before us today; and I am doing it principally on account of the attitude of the women themselves, as I observe it, interpret it, and understand it. I understand very well the difficulty of getting concrete and definite expressions of the sentiment of women. Still we are all capable of reading public and private discussions, and hearing the expressions that are made by the women in public and private; and as we look over the field and see a body of women organized to secure the ballot for women, insistent perhaps in their demands and other requests, I am really sorry that I cannot vote to give the ballot to those women, because I think they would take up their duties and large responsibilities with high intelligence, with patriotism and with devotion to their duties, but that is not all of it. If we give it to them, we have got to give it to the whole body of women, and I look farther and I see an organized body of women opposing such action, and they tell us that the major-

ity of the women of Maine do not want the ballot; and I look still farther and I see a great body of women who are so well content with the opportunities to exert their influence in the affairs of the country, that they shrink from the responsibility of having additional duties laid upon them. I do not need to argue to this House the uselessness of having a large body of qualified electors who do not exercise their suffrage. This evil is perhaps greater in the larger centers of population, but even in rural Maine it is recognized as such an evil that makes states consider the matter of compulsory voting, and a committee of this legislature has considered that subject and has wisely reported that legislation is inexpedient because compulsory voting can never be a success. You cannot galvanize a dormant voter into an active citizen by an act of the legislature or by constitutional amendment. If you extend suffrage to women, you are doubling the size of your electorate, and unless my judgment is entirely wrong, you are vastly increasing the percentage of those who will not exercise the suffrage if given to them.

Now it is not an experimental matter except in one point of view. We can enact a law or we can repeal it, or we can amend it, or amend it as amended, and so an ad infinitum, sometimes ad absurdum. I heard the argument a few days ago, and I was a little surprised to hear it, that this matter was entirely within the province of the legislature; that you give the ballot to women and if it does not work well, the men of some other legislature without any regard to the women themselves, can take it away from them. You all know, gentlemen, deep in your hearts, that if this measure should pass, the women of Maine would have the Presidential suffrage for all times, at least as long as time is of any concern to us who are here; but so long as the atmosphere of the present electorate is as cool toward the demand of this body of women as recent events have shown it to be; so long as there is only a minority of women who come before us with insistent and persistent demands to

vote; so long as another minority persists in planting the red rose; so long as there is a great body of women who are so concerned with their own personal affairs, they are only passively in favor of this or are intentionally or actively opposed or utterly indifferent, I must consider it unwise to put the ballot in the hands of the sex, so large a proportion of whom do not desire this privilege and are not willing to assume its responsibilities. It is easy to say that this thing is inevitable; let us not stand in the way of it; but my judgment dictates otherwise.

Mr. BARNES OF HOULTON: I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of the previous question, which takes one-third of the membership present, will rise and stand until counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BERRY of Waterville: Mr. Speaker, I move that when the vote is taken, it be taken by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House now is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The SPEAKER: And the gentleman from Waterville, moves that when the vote be taken it be taken by yeas and nays. All those in favor of it being taken by yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Maher, that the House adopt Senate Amendment B to Senate Amendment A. This provides that the bill shall be referred to the voters of the State at a special election to be held on the second Monday of September, 1919. All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment will say yes when their names are called; those opposed will say no.

YEA—Audibert, Austin of Milford, Austin of South Berwick, Bean, Berry, Burns of Eagle Lake, Carey, Carleton, Case, Chamberlin of Lebanon, Clifford,

Crane, Doyle, Dunn, Dunning, Eaton, Flint, Fowles, Gilmour, Granville, Greeley, Hammond, Hanson, Holley, Houghton, Jillson, Jones, Lausier, Leathers, Leonard, Macomber, Maher, Mathews, McLeary, Mitchell, Morin, Nelson, O'Connell, Owen, Pattee, Peabody, Perkins of Boothbay Harbor, Perkins of Orono, Pike, Porter, Reed, Ring, Roberts, Simons, Small, Stanley, Sweatt, Thomas of Harpswell, Varney of Jonesboro, Williams of Wells, Wilson of Portland, Wyman—57.

NAY—Adams, Alden, Allan of Portland, Anderson, Arthur, Barnes, Baxter, Bowie, Bragdon, Brann, Brewster, Brown, Burns of Madison, Buzzell, Cates, Chamberlain of Winslow, Chaplin, Chellis, Clason, Cochrane, Colcord, Cole, Conary, Corliss, Cowan, Crabtree, Cunningham, Daigle, Dain, Davis of Freeport, Davis of Old Town, Dolloff, Dutton, Fagan, Farnsworth, Farrington, Foss, Forbes, Fuller, Garcelon, Grinnell, Hatch, Hinckley, Hussey, Jordan of New Gloucester, Landpher, Marr, Mason, Miller, Millett, Mulligan, Murchie, Murray, Orff, Overlock, Plummer, Ricker, Ridlon, Rounds, Rowe, Savage, Smith, Stacey, Stevens, Storm, Swift, Thomas of South Portland, Tilden, Varney of Windham, Warren, Washburn, Williams of Auburn, Wilson of Presque Isle.—73.

ABSENT—Allen of Sanford, Brackett, Bradford, Casey, Coulombe, Furbish, Gray, Hisler, Jordan of Cape Elizabeth, Langelier, Love, Mace, Murch, O'Leary, Phillips, Putnam, Rowell, Sanborn, Sawyer, Sullivan, Weatherbee—21.

The SPEAKER: Fifty-seven having voted in the affirmative and 73 in the negative, the motion to adopt the amendment is lost.

There is another amendment in

connection with this bill, Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Baxter of Portland, it was voted to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment A.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, if in order, I move that the bill be given its second reading.

Mr. PIKE of Eastport: Mr. Speaker, if the amendments have been disposed of, I presume it is in order for debate on the merits of the bill, is it not?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the bill has had its first reading. That brought up the question of amendments, both of which have been rejected, and automatically under the rules, the bill takes its second reading and is assigned for tomorrow for its third reading, when it will come up for any further action that the House may desire to take.

Mr. PIKE: Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting very late, and as I desire to be heard upon the merits of the bill, I think I will defer it until tomorrow.

The bill then received its second reading.

On motion by Mr. Barnes of Houlton,

The House recessed until 9 A. M. Wednesday morning.