



RURAL OR STAR ROUTE
BOX HOLDERS
LOCAL

[INDICIA]
Sec. 4351/2, P.L.&R.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PORTLAND, ME.
Permit No. 465

Does
TEMPERANCE
MEAN
PROHIBITION ?

FACTS
you should *know* before
voting Sept. 14th

SAMPLE BALLOT INSIDE

Contributed to Maine Memory Network by Maine Historical Society
(Coll. 2093, Box 1/3)
Date: 1936
Description: Sample ballot and brochure

We tried the open saloon and we tried prohibition. The first was a curse and the second was a failure

PROHIBITION FAILED

1. Because it was Impracticable

Prohibition was unenforceable. The territory it sought to protect was too great. Surrounded by wet communities in every direction, it could not restrain the illegal traffic in intoxicants no matter how honest and efficient its officials.

2. Because it Opened the Door and Laid the Foundation for the Bootlegger and Racketeer

With so large a percentage of the population wanting and accustomed to the use of alcoholic beverages, when they could not get the same legally, they sought it by unlawful means and through illegal sources. This consequently made prohibition territory a paradise and opened channels for those engaged in illegal traffic.

3. Because it was Economically Unsound

The millions of dollars now being spent in the State of Maine for liquors of all kinds, were, under prohibition, going into the coffers and pockets of out-of-state bootleggers.

4. Because it was Morally Inadequate

It prohibited the sale and purchase of alcoholic beverages without having prepared the people by appropriate temperance instruction and reverence for law and order for its proper observance and enforcement.

It was a restraint upon the public for which it was not prepared and which it did not observe. Under prohibition the State of Maine was theoretically dry but in active practice, decidedly opposite.

5. Because it put Absolute Prohibition ahead of Freedom of Conduct and Temperance when the Opposite Order should be Observed

It sought the imposition of moral conduct by law instead of education. It imposed a restriction upon personal conduct for which it was not prepared and which it could and would not bear.

We tried the open saloon and we tried prohibition. The first was a curse and the second was a failure
PROHIBITION FAILED

1. Because it was Impracticable

Prohibition was unenforceable. The territory it sought to protect was too great. Surrounded by wet communities in every direction, it could not restrain the illegal traffic in intoxicants no matter how honest and efficient its officials.

2. Because it Opened the Door and Laid the Foundation for the Bootlegger and Racketeer

With so large a percentage of the population wanting and accustomed to the use of alcoholic beverages, when they could not get the same legally, they sought it by unlawful means and through illegal sources. This consequently made prohibition territory a paradise and opened channels for those engaged in illegal traffic.

3. Because it was Economically Unsound

The millions of dollars now being spent in the State of Maine for liquors of all kinds, were, under prohibition, going into the coffers and pockets of out-of-state bootleggers.

4. Because it was Morally Inadequate

It prohibited the sale and purchase of alcoholic beverages without having prepared the people by appropriate temperance instruction and reverence for law and order for its proper observance and enforcement.

It was a restraint upon the public for which it was not prepared and which it did not observe. Under prohibition the State of Maine was theoretically dry but in active practice, decidedly opposite.

5. Because it put Absolute Prohibition ahead of Freedom of Conduct and Temperance when the Opposite Order should be Observed

It sought the imposition of moral conduct by law instead of education. It imposed a restriction upon personal conduct for which it was not prepared and which it could and would not bear.

Our present State system for the regulation of the liquor traffic is economically sound, morally right, confines the business within narrow circles and tends to honest and efficient control. It makes alcoholic beverages available for all legitimate purposes, medicinal, mechanical and social; and supplemented by sound and aggressive temperance instruction, it establishes liberty, security and prosperity.

FINANCIALLY GOOD

For example: We have learned that those serving beer in the State of Maine pay a tax of a half million dollars a year. They employ 7500 people. Six million dollars has been spent by them on improving property. They spend each year nearly a half million dollars for fuel. Their light bills are nearly half a million dollars. They spend over two million dollars a year in rent. In addition to this, of course, the commission employs many more people for administrative work. From a standpoint of strict economics, the beer industry has done a great deal to help Maine. Of course in other parts of the country the brewing interests spend more than two hundred million dollars a year in expenses, buy millions of dollars worth of farm products in the manufacture of beer and employs six hundred and sixty thousand people. Strictly speaking, beer has helped the prosperity of the country.

WHAT DOCTORS SAY

Medical authorities tell us that they prescribe beer as a tonic for sixty-seven per cent of their patients. And we have found that in 1933 when we were allowed beer there was less intoxication than ever before, and police authorities at that time were warm in their enthusiasm concerning conditions.

An interesting fact is that tourists coming into the State of Maine put themselves on record as being in favor of our Maine laws. In other words, they felt that if they wished to be temperate in drinking and wanted a glass of beer they should be allowed to have it, and it is a well known fact that the tourist business in the State of Maine in the past two years has been better than ever before.

WHO GETS INTOXICATED

The question of whether or not people become intoxicated by beer is rather an interesting one. From a survey recently made, it was learned that the average person going into a restaurant serving beer did not drink over

Our present State system for the regulation of the liquor traffic is economically sound, morally right, confines the business within narrow circles and tends to honest and efficient control. It makes alcoholic beverages available for all legitimate purposes, medicinal, mechanical and social; and supplemented by sound and aggressive temperance instruction, it establishes liberty, security and prosperity.

FINANCIALLY GOOD

For example: We have learned that those serving beer in the State of Maine pay a tax of a half million dollars a year. They employ 7500 people. Six million dollars has been spent by them on improving property. They spend each year nearly a half million dollars for fuel. Their light bills are nearly half a million dollars. They spend over two million dollars a year in rent. In addition to this, of course, the commission employs many more people for administrative work. From a standpoint of strict economics, the beer industry has done a great deal to help Maine. Of course in other parts of the country the brewing interests spend more than two hundred million dollars a year in expenses, buy million of dollars worth of farm products in the manufacture of beer and employs six hundred and sixty thousand people. Strictly speaking, beer has helped the prosperity of the country.

WHAT DOCTORS SAY

Medical authorities tell us that they prescribe beer as a tonic for sixty-seven per cent of their patients. And we have found that in 1933 when we were allowed beer there was less intoxication than ever before, and police authorities at that time were warm in their enthusiasm concerning conditions.

An interesting fact is that tourists coming into the State of Maine put themselves on record as being in favor of our Maine laws. In other words they felt that if they wished to be temperate in drinking and wanted a glass of beer they should be allowed to have it, and it is a well known fact that the tourist business in the State of Maine in the past two years has been better than ever before.

WHO GETS INTOXICATED

The question of whether or not people become intoxicated by beer is rather an interesting one. From a survey recently made, it was learned that the average person going into a restaurant serving beer did not drink over

three glasses of beer, and according to the University of Chicago which made scientific tests, headed by Prof. A. J. Carlson, we learned that the consumption of four bottles of beer in thirty minutes did not produce intoxication. Thus, we find that if the average person drinks only three glasses of beer, which is equivalent to less than two full bottles, that the person is not becoming intoxicated because of beer.

— PROMOTE TEMPERANCE —

It is the aim of the United Temperance League to promote true temperance, to promote it through a series of lectures in public schools, motion pictures, service clubs and through the medium of the press and radio.

We feel that should our present laws concerning beer be repealed that we should be defeating a movement that can not help but bring true temperance and greater law enforcement. The United Temperance League advocates strict enforcement of the laws. It knows that it is impossible to fight a hidden enemy. At least our present laws bring everything to the open and we can see what evils to fight; but should we repeal our present laws it would simply mean a return of bootlegger dives, which it has proved in the past impossible to successfully fight.

We ask every fair-minded citizen to do his utmost in the promotion of temperance, not only in drinking temperate drinks in moderation but in spreading this gospel among his friends. Go to the polls September 14 and mark "YES" on question No. 3 on the referendum ballot which says, "Shall this city or town be permitted the sale therein of malt liquors" and bear in mind that malt liquors mean beer and ale.

United Temperance League
Harry A. Belyea, Executive Sec'y
278 Middle St., Portland, Me.

*Maintain our present State Liquor Laws. Vote for
both freedom and temperance at the State election
September 14, 1936*

TEMPERANCE THROUGH EDUCATION—
NOT LEGISLATION

three glasses of beer, and according to the University of Chicago which made scientific tests, headed by Prof. A.J. Carlson, we learned that the consumption of four bottles of beer in thirty minutes did not produce intoxication. Thus, we find that if the average person drinks only three glasses of beer, which is equivalent to less than two full bottles, that the person is not becoming intoxicated because of beer.

— PROMOTE TEMPERANCE —

It is the aim of the United Temperance League to promote true temperance, to promote it through a series of lectures in public schools, motion pictures, service clubs and through the medium of the press and radio.

We feel that should our present laws concerning beer be repealed that we should be defeating a movement that can not help but bring true temperance and greater law enforcement. The United Temperance League advocates strict enforcement of the laws. It knows that it is impossible to fight a hidden enemy. At least our present laws bring everything to the open and we can see what evils to fight; but should we repeal our present laws it would simply mean a return of bootlegger dives, which it has proved in the past impossible to successfully fight.

We ask every fair-minded citizen to do his utmost in the promotion of temperance, not only in drinking temperate drinks in moderation but in spreading this gospel among his friends. Go to the polls September 14 and mark "YES" on question No. 3 on the referendum ballot which says, "Shall this city or town be permitted the sale therein of malt liquors" and bear in mind that malt liquors mean beer and ale.

United Temperance League
Harry A. Belyea, Executive Sec'y
278 Middle St., Portland, Me.

*Maintain our present State Liquor Laws. Vote for
both freedom and temperance at the State election
September 14, 1936*

TEMPERANCE THROUGH EDUCATION —
NOT LEGISLATION

STATE OF MAINE

Referendum Questions to be Voted Upon September 14, 1936

Penalty for willfully defacing, tearing down, removing or destroying an official list of questions submitted to the electors, or a specimen ballot, FIVE TO ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS.

LEWIS O. BARROWS, Secretary of State.

Those in favor of any or all, of the following proposed questions will place a cross (X) in each, or any, of the squares marked "YES" devoted to the question, or questions, for which they desire to vote; those opposed will place a cross (X) in the opposite square or squares marked "NO."

SPECIMEN BALLOT

YES

QUESTION NO. 1

NO

"Shall state stores for the sale of liquor be operated by permission of the state liquor commission in this city or town?"

YES

QUESTION NO. 2

NO

"Shall licenses be granted in this city or town under regulation of the state liquor commission for the sale therein of wine and spirits to be consumed on the premises?"

STATE OF MAINE

Referendum Questions to be Voted Upon September 14, 1936

Penalty for willfully defacing, tearing down, removing or destroying an official list of questions submitted to the electors, or a specimen ballot, FIVE TO ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS.

LEWIS O. BARROWS, Secretary of State.

Those in favor of any or all, of the following proposed questions will place a cross (X) in each, or any, of the squares marked "YES" devoted to the question, or questions, for which they desire to vote; those opposed will place a cross (X) in the opposite square or squares marked "NO."

SPECIMEN BALLOT

YES

[box for mark]

QUESTION NO. 1

NO

[box for mark]

"Shall state stores for the sale of liquor be operated by permission of the state liquor commission in this city or town?"

YES

[box for mark]

QUESTION NO. 2

NO

[box for mark]

"Shall licenses be granted in this city or town under regulation of the state liquor commission for the sale therein of wine and spirits to be consumed on the premises?"

YES

NO

QUESTION NO. 3

"Shall licenses be granted in this city or town for the sale therein of malt liquor?"

Questions 1, 2 and 3 are prepared pursuant to Chapter 157 of the Public Laws of 1935.

YES

NO

QUESTION NO. 4

Shall An Act Entitled "AN ACT Relative to Resident Fishing and Hunting Licenses," Become a Law?

Question No. 4 prepared pursuant to Referendum Petitions filed in the office of the Secretary of State and by proclamation of the Governor issued September 4, 1935.

YES

NO

QUESTION NO. 5

Shall a Bill Entitled "AN ACT Relating to the Use of the General Highway Fund, and to Prevent Diversion Thereof," Become a Law?

"Section 1. All revenue received by the State from the registration of motor vehicles, and the licensing of operators thereof, from the tax imposed on internal combustion engine fuel, from fines, forfeitures and costs accruing to the State under Section 118 of Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and from permits granted by the State Highway Commission to open highways, shall be segregated, allocated to and become a part of the general highway fund created and existing by Chapter 251 of the Public Laws of 1931 and Chapter 175 of the Public Laws of 1933; and after payment and deduction from such fund of such sums as are necessary to meet all provisions of bond issues for State highway and bridge construction, the remainder of such fund shall be apportioned and expended solely for the cost of registering motor vehicles and licensing the operators thereof, for maintenance of the State highway police, for administration of the office and duties of the State Highway Commission, for administration of the tax on internal combustion engine fuel and payment of rebates on said tax, and for the improvement, construction and maintenance of highways and bridges, and for snow guards or removal as provided by statute. Neither the general highway fund, nor any fund derived from direct taxation imposed for highway construction, bridge construction, or the improvement and maintenance thereof, shall be diverted or expended, either temporarily or permanently, for any other purpose than set forth in this act, except for the establishment of an aeronautical fund as provided by Section 89A of Chapter 12 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 2. All acts and parts of acts, inconsistent with this act, are hereby repealed."

Question No. 5 prepared pursuant to a Referendum Petition filed with the 87th Legislature and by them submitted to the electors according to the provisions of Section 18, of Article XXXI, of the Constitution.

YES

NO

[box marked with an X]

[box for mark]

QUESTION NO. 3

"Shall licenses be granted in this city or town for the sale therein of malt liquor?"

Questions 1, 2 and 3 are prepared pursuant to Chapter 157 of the Public Laws of 1935.

YES

NO

[box]

[box]

QUESTION NO. 4

Shall An Act Entitled "AN ACT Relative to Resident Fishing and Hunting Licenses," Become a Law?

Question No.4 prepared pursuant to Referendum Petitions filed in the office of the Secretary of State and by proclamation of the Governor issued September 4, 1935.

YES

NO

[box]

[box]

QUESTION NO. 5

Shall a Bill Entitled "AN ACT Relating to the Use of the General Highway Fund, and to Prevent Diversion Thereof," Become a Law?

"Section 1. All revenue received by the State from the registration of motor vehicles, and the licensing of operators thereof, from the tax imposed on internal combustion engine fuel, from fines forfeitures and costs accruing to the State under Section 118 of Chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and from permits granted by the State Highway Commission to open highways, shall be segregated, allocated to and become a part of the general highway fund created and existing by Chapter 251 of the Public Laws of 1931 and Chapter 175 of the Public Laws of 1933; and after payment and deduction from such funds of such sums as are necessary to meet all provisions of bond issues for State highway and bridge construction, the remainder of such fund shall be apportioned and expended solely for the cost of registering motor vehicles and licensing the operators thereof, for maintenance of the State highway police, for administration of the office and duties of the State Highway Commission, for the administration of the tax on internal combustion engine fuel and payments of rebates on said tax, and for the improvement, construction and maintenance of highways and bridges, and for snow guards or removal as provided by statute. Neither the general highway fund, nor any fund derived from direct taxation imposed for highway construction, bridge construction, or the improvement or maintenance thereof, shall be diverted or expended, either temporarily or permanently, for any other purpose than set forth in this act, except for the establishment of an aeronautical fund as provided by Section 89A of Chapter 12 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 2. All acts and parts of acts, inconsistent with this act, are hereby repealed."

Question No. 5 prepared pursuant to a Referendum Petition filed with the 87th Legislature and by them submitted to the electors according to the provisions of Section 18, of Article XXXI, of the Constitution.