

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

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 preferences 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.