

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-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1917

AUGUSTA
KENNEBEC JOURNAL PRINT
1916

SENATE

Tuesday, March 27, 1917.

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Annie J. Gwynn of Hallowell.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the House disposed of in concurrence.

From the House: An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 204 of the law of 1915 relating to the salary of the register of probate in Piscataquis county.

In the House the bill was substituted for the report; in the Senate the report of the committee, ought not to pass, was accepted in non-concurrence.

In the House that body insisted upon its former action and appointed a committee of conference.

On motion by Mr. Stanley of Oxford the Senate insisted on its former action and joined a committee of conference. The Chair appointed on such committee of conference on the part of the Senate, Messrs. Stanley, Conant and Petersen.

From the House: Resolve in favor of Joseph H. Underwood.

In the House this resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A; in the Senate it was indefinitely postponed.

In the House that body insisted upon its former action and appointed a committee of conference.

On motion by Mr. Googin of Androscoggin, the Senate insisted upon its former action and joined a committee of conference. The Chair appointed upon such committee of conference on the part of the Senate Messrs. Googin, Deering and Baxter.

House Bills in First Reading.

H. D. 556. An Act to provide for the expenses of the Legislature, for salaries fixed by law, for departmental expenses of the State government and for the maintenance of the several State institutions during the period

of the biennial sessions of the Legislature.

H. D. 426. An Act to prevent discrimination against soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States or State of Maine on account of their uniform.

H. D. 646. An Act to prohibit the selling or giving away of air rifles to children under 14 years of age.

House 34. An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 86 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, entitled "Civil Cases."

House 172. An Act to incorporate the St. Croix Water Co.

House 397. An Act to amend Section 58, Chapter 64, Revised Statutes, relative to the licensing of children's homes and maternity hospitals.

House 408. An Act to amend Section 42 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, relating to expenses of county commissioners.

House 508. An Act amending Section 14 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes in relation to the custody of minor children at the time of decreeing a divorce.

House 516. An Act to discharge of record attachments of real estate which have lapsed.

House 527. An Act to amend Section 4 of Chapter 76 of the Revised Statutes, relating to notices upon petitions for sale of real estate.

House 553. An Act to amend Sections 12 and 13 of Chapter 37, Revised Statutes, relative to the inspection of milk, and to provide a penalty for interference with inspectors appointed by cities and towns in the performance of their duties.

House 649. An Act in relation to the sale of timber on reserved lands in all townships or tracts.

House 650. An Act to amend Section 79 of Chapter 57 of the Revised Statutes relating to railroad crossings.

House 651. An Act to incorporate the Summer Harbor Water Co.

House 653. An Act to provide compensation for injuries received by State employes.

House 654. An Act authorizing the Biddeford and Saco Water Co. to increase its capital stock and to hold securities in other corporations.

House 655. An Act to amend Sec-

tions 4, 5 and 7 of Chapter 95 of the Revised Statutes of Maine, in relation to mortgages of real estate.

House 656. An Act to amend Chapter 117, Section 5, Revised Statutes, relating to the expenses of the justices of the supreme judicial court.

House 635. Resolve, making appropriation for support of bureau of weights and measures for years 1917 and 1918.

Messages and Documents from the Heads of Departments

A communication was received from the office of the Secretary of State transmitting the report of the library commission of Maine for the years 1915 and 1916.

On motion by Mr. Ricker of Hancock, placed on file.

The following communication was read by the secretary:

Washington, D. C., March 23, 1917.
Mr. W. E. Lawry, Secretary,
Senate Chamber,
Augusta, Maine.

Dear Sir:

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your courteous letter of March 20 enclosing an order passed by the Legislature of Maine inviting me to address that body. Mr. Baxter has notified me that the date has been changed to the 27th, and I take pleasure in accepting for that date.

Sincerely yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT.

On motion by Mr. Baxter of Sagadahoc, placed on file.

Bills in First Reading

S. D. 398. An Act to provide for the establishment of polling districts in towns.

S. D. 399. An Act to prohibit the carrying of dangerous or deadly weapons without a license.

S. D. 400. An Act to amend Section 5 of Chapter 145, Revised Statutes of nineteen hundred sixteen, relative to admittance and charges for patients at State sanatoriums.

S. D. 401. An Act to amend Section 45 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the amounts to be paid for clerk hire in the county offices.

S. D. 402. An Act authorizing the

treasurer of State to negotiate a temporary loan.

S. D. 403. An Act to legalize the doings of the inhabitants of the town of Windham at the annual town meeting held on March 5, A. D., 1917, and by adjournment, on March 7, A. D., 1917.

S. D. 404. An Act to amend Section 8 of Chapter 325 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, as amended by Chapter 155 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915, fixing the salary for the recorder of the municipal court of Waterville.

S. D. 405. Resolve providing an epidemic or emergency fund.

S. D. 407. An Act to provide for better telephone service.

Reports of Committees

Mr. Boynton from the committee on agriculture, on An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 48 of the Revised Statutes, relating to testing commodities offered for sale (Senate No. 287), reported that the same ought to pass. (Read first time under suspension of the rules on motion by Mr. Boynton of Lincoln.)

Mr. Peterson from the same committee, on Resolve making appropriation for support of bureau of markets for the years 1917 and 1918, submitted the same in a new draft under title of "An Act to provide for the establishment of a bureau of markets and to provide for marketing farm products and purchasing farm supplies," and that it ought to pass.

Mr. Wood from the committee on sea and shore fisheries, on Petitions of Frank A. Babbidge and 16 others, A. E. Gray and 18 others and L. V. Joyce and 38 others praying that Chapter 85 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915 entitled "An Act establishing a close time on lobsters in certain waters of Hancock county" be repealed, submitted bill, "An Act to amend Section 1 of Chapter 85 of the Private and Special Laws of 1915 entitled 'An Act establishing a close time on lobsters in certain waters of Hancock county,'" and that it ought to pass.

The reports were accepted and the several bills and resolves tabled for printing under the joint rules.

Mr. Peterson from the committee on agriculture, on An Act to amend Section

4 of Chapter 38 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to protection of trees and shrubs, reported that the same ought not to pass.

Mr. Boynton from the same committee, on An Act to amend Chapter 38, Section 9, of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to owners of real estate to destroy insects; owner neglecting, towns shall destroy (Senate No. 345), reported same ought not to pass.

The reports were accepted and sent down for concurrence.

Passed to Be Engrossed

H. D. 126. An Act to establish the police court in the city of Belfast.

H. D. 185. An Act relating to Vassalboro, China and Windsor Light and Power Company. (Tabled pending acceptance of House Amendment A, on motion by Mr. Deering of York.)

H. D. 254. An Act to amend the charter of the Central Maine Power Company. (Tabled pending acceptance of House Amendment A, on motion by Mr. Deering of York.)

H. D. 305. An Act additional to Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the enforcement of the laws against the sale of intoxicating liquors. (Tabled on motion by Mr. Walker of Somerset pending passage to be engrossed.)

H. D. 306. An Act to amend Sections 1, 2 and 4 of Chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes, relating to nuisances.

H. D. 307. An Act to repeal Section 42 of Chapter 126, and to amend Section 27 of Chapter 136 and Section 1 of Chapter 137 of the Revised Statutes, relating to imposing sentences.

H. D. 308. An Act to amend Section 70 and 71 of Chapter 57 of the Revised Statutes, relating to disorderly conduct on railroad, steambot and ferry property, and authorizing railroad employes to arrest such offenders.

H. D. 431. An Act to amend Section 10 of Chapter 102 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the discharge from imprisonment in bastardy cases.

H. D. 561. An Act to extend the charter of the Lubec, East Machias and Machias Railway Co.

H. D. 576. An Act to amend the charter of the city of Hallowell.

(On motion by Mr. Chick of Kenne-

bec, Senate Amendment A, offered for the purpose of correcting an error was adopted, and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed.)

H. D. 580. An Act to incorporate the Grand Isle Light & Power Co. (Tabled pending acceptance of House Amendment A, on motion by Mr. Deering of York.)

H. D. 606. An Act to incorporate the Boothbay Harbor Water District.

H. D. 612. An Act to incorporate the Brassua Stream Dam & Improvement Co.

H. D. 617. An Act to legalize and confirm the incorporation and doings of the Congregational parish of Weld, Maine, and to authorize the conveyance of its real estate.

H. D. 618. An Act to prevent cruelty to animals in the sale and transportation of horses.

H. D. 622. An Act to amend Section 34 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, relating to free transportation of firemen and policemen by public utilities. (Tabled pending acceptance of House Amendment A on motion by Mr. Lord of York.)

H. D. 627. An Act to authorize the town of Caribou to acquire the property of the Caribou Water, Light & Power Co. and to construct and maintain a system of water works.

H. D. 628. Resolve, in favor of home for aged women, Belfast.

H. D. 629. Resolve in favor of Calais hospital.

H. D. 630. Resolve in favor of the Sisters of Charity of Waterville, Maine.

H. D. 631. Resolve in favor of Anson Academy.

H. D. 632. Resolve making an appropriation for co-operative agricultural work between the College of Agriculture of the University of Maine and the United States department of agriculture.

H. D. 633. Resolve making appropriation to support the bureau of horticulture.

H. D. 634. Resolve appropriating money for the protection of trees and shrubs from the ravages of dangerous insects and diseases.

H| D. 636. Resolve making appropriation for New England Fruit Show to be held in year 1917.

H. D. 637. Resolve making an appropriation for the control of contagious diseases among domestic animals.

H. D. 638. Resolve making appropriation to assist, encourage and develop the poultry industry in Maine.

H. D. 639. An Act to amend Chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the livestock sanitary commissioner.

H. D. 640. Resolve making an appropriation for the Maine Seed Improvement Association.

S. D. 288. An Act to accept the benefits of An Act of Congress to provide for the promotion of vocational education.

S. D. 306. An Act to amend Section 24 of Chapter 58 of the Revised Statutes of the State of Maine, relating to unclaimed baggage and merchandise transported by street railways.

S. D. 341. An Act to amend Section 20 of Chapter 144 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to the commitment of girls to the State School for Girls. (Tabled on motion by Mr. Marshall of Cumberland, pending passage to be engrossed.)

S. D. 344. An Act to amend Section 8 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes, relative to time for hearing of libels for divorce.

S. D. 379. An Act to amend Chapter 452 of the Private and Special Laws of 1897, relating to the trustees of the fund for the support of the Episcopate of the Protestant Episcopal church in the diocese of Maine.

S. D. 386. An Act to amend Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, increasing the salary of county attorney and of assistant county attorney for Cumberland county and to provide clerk hire therefor.

S. D. 387. An Act to amend Section 20 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, increasing the salary of the chief clerk in the department of education.

S. D. 388. An Act to create a State department of health.

S. D. 389. An Act amending Section 17 of Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes relative to granting lobster licenses.

S. D. 390. An Act in relation to the duties of county attorneys.

S. D. 391. An Act to grant a new charter to the city of Auburn.

S. D. 392. An Act to amend Section 35 of Chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes, fixing a fee for registering motor cars in neutral automobile zones.

S. D. 393. An Act to prevent public discrimination by reason of religious creed at places of public accommodation, resort or amusement. (Tabled by Mr. Marshall of Cumberland pending passage to be engrossed.)

S. D. 394. An Act to amend Chapter 75 of the Revised Statutes of 1916, relating to sales of real estate by license of court.

S. D. 395. An Act to amend Revised Statutes, Chapter 117, Section 16, increasing the salary of the State treasurer.

S. D. 396. Resolve in favor of Mrs. Mabel G. Sanborn of Augusta for money expended in support of Kate C. Robbins, a State pensioner now deceased.

S. D. 397. An Act to amend Section 32 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, increasing the salary of the clerk of the board of State assessors.

An Act relating to the place of payment in this State of dividends declared by foreign mutual fire insurance companies.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act making it unlawful to give checks or drafts on banks where the maker has not sufficient funds or credit to pay same, and providing a penalty therefor.

Assigned for Today

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate, An Act relating to the Knox Gas & Electric Co., tabled by Mr. Holt of Cumberland.

Mr. HOLT: Mr. President, I move that this bill be tabled and assigned for Thursday. I do this not at my own request, but at the request of certain other senators who wish more time to prepare for the discussion of this subject.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate, H. D. 350, An Act to create a board of prison commissioners, tabled by Mr. Deering of York.

Mr. DEERING: Mr. President, I desire to withdraw my motion to non-concur in the adoption of House Amendment A.

The motion was agreed to, and on further motion by the same Senator House Amendment A was adopted in concurrence.

On further motion by the same senator, Senate Amendment A was adopted, and the bill as amended was then passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Holt of Cumberland, S. D. 218, An Act to enlarge the powers of the Western Maine Power Co. was re-assigned for next Thursday morning.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate Report A, and Report B from the committee on education on H. D. 321, An Act to provide for the distribution of state school funds available for the support of common schools.

Report A, ought to pass.

Report B, ought not to pass.

Mr. RICKER of Hancock: Mr. President, I wish to move that Report B, be accepted. I wish to call the attention of the senators to a few facts and will try as far as I can not to duplicate facts that have already been stated in the House in support of Report B.

In supporting my motion I shall, in order to facilitate the business of the Senate, and with the thought that you are all to a certain extent familiar with the history of the school fund and its disposition, devote only a brief period to its history.

Starting in 1828 with the sale of 20 townships of land this fund was increased later by the addition of money received from Massachusetts on account of claims against the United States for services in the war of 1812, and by the bank tax of 1833.

In 1855 public land equal to 24 half townships was set apart for the benefit of common schools, to be held in trust for that purpose only.

In 1857, 20 per cent of all moneys accruing from the sale of public lands

were applied to the permanent school fund for the benefit of common schools.

In 1863 there was remitted to the banks an amount of their state tax equal to the amount required to be paid to the United States by the law establishing National banks.

This reduced the school fund to such an extent that in 1872 the first mill tax was created under the conditions of which a general tax of one mill per dollar was to be annually assessed upon all the property of the state and the proceeds paid into the state treasury and designated as the school mill fund.

The distribution of this fund was on the basis of the number of scholars in each city and town.

In 1907 this mill tax was increased from one to one and one half mills. Jan. 1, 1912 this fund reached the sum of over \$1,400,000.

In 1909 because it was believed wild lands were not being assessed a proper proportion of the tax there was laid a special tax of one and one half mills on this property.

Discussion as to its disposition was narrowed to two arguments, whether it should be applied to highways or schools, and eventually it was designated for use of the common schools and the common school fund was created.

This as you of course understand was not an educational matter; it came from the committee on taxation as a purely tax measure and a concise explanation was given at the hearing on March 7th.

It must now be understood that this made two separate funds for the use of common schools.

The school mill fund created in 1872 and the common school fund of 1909.

The first one was distributed as before stated on the basis of the number of scholars in each town, but now came the question of how the second one should be distributed.

The final disposition was that one half mill of this second fund should be added to the one and one half mills of the first fund, making two mills distributed on the census basis, and

the remaining mill of the second fund on the valuation of each city and town.

So that to sum up there are now three mills appropriated for the use of common schools, distributed on the basis of two mills census and one mill on the valuation of each municipality.

Now in estimating the expenditure of this money it was found that local conditions varied to such an extent that it would be practically impossible to make an equal distribution and so an equalization fund was created by deducting a certain amount from the common school fund and designate this as an equalization fund.

This fund starting in 1909 with \$20,000 was increased to \$27,500 in 1911, \$40,000 in 1913, \$50,000 in 1915 and there being enough money for all purposes it was left at this figure at this session.

So much for an explanation of our school funds and their distribution.

* * * * *

No sooner had this law gone into effect than new methods of distribution were devised.

Census, average attendance in common schools, average in all schools aggregated and combinations were incorporated in the different bills.

Not because there was any real demand as the law had had no trial, but because certain narrow minded individuals could only see to the limits of their own town and the fact that this was general and not special legislation carried no weight with them.

The result was that the Legislature of 1911 appointed a committee of five on the part of the Senate and three on the part of the house to investigate the whole school matter.

This committee composed of eminent men held meetings in all sections of the State, received evidence from everyone interested and examined every phrase of the situation carefully.

Senate document 121, reported Jan. 29, 1913 to the legislature of that year showed the result of their hard and conscientious work and from this I wish to quote: "The only note of agreement that the committee finds is that wherever basis is adopted none

can be found which will absolutely equalize inequalities among the several communities of the state."

Then follows a general discussion of all the proposed measures, which is not necessary for me to enlarge upon at this time.

In 1913 your committee reported ought not to pass on the bill presented and the legislature so voted.

In 1915 your committee reported 9 against the bill, one in favor and the legislature again voted ought not to pass.

This year your committee report is evenly divided three of the members formerly on this committee and voting (ought not to pass,) changing their vote (ought to pass) although the arguments in favor of this bill were far from convincing and much weaker than former years.

Now these changes have been advocated principally by the legislative committee of the Grange and so this is called the Grange Bill.

While this committee claims and I presume does represent the Grange as a body, it does seem too bad to saddle the individual members of the Grange with a bill of this kind.

Personally I believe the work of the Grange is of the greatest value to the State and that as individuals they have the welfare of the State at heart.

I do not however believe that if each member of the Grange understood the situation as regards the school funds, that they would support the continual harassing of the legislature with freak measures, emanating from a few whose ambitions seem to be to spend a part of the winter during every legislative session in Augusta, at whose expense I do not know, but presume that the phrase "Jones pays the freight" would explain the situation.

You have all heard read many petitions from Granges favoring this new bill; also petitions against its passage. You are also aware of the fact that petitions as a rule are of very little value, this being well illustrated that many Granges have sent petitions both for and against this fund. Facts count most and I wish to give an il-

illustration of the way petitions work.

In 1913 and 15 I was Secretary of the committee on education. In 1915 especially I examined the petitions sent in favoring that bill for a change in the distribution in favor of aggregate attendance.

The Grange in Bowdoinham signed it, yet they stood to lose \$300. Munroe loss \$264. China \$200. Lee \$225. Augusta \$2600. Belfast \$1300. Vassalboro \$325. Ellsworth \$1000. Dedham \$60. Brunswick \$5000 and so on through a long list.

One Grange with over 240 members sent in a petition on the bottom of which the secretary wrote in red ink, "Only 50 present. Vote divided."

If you will look over the petitions this year you will find the same conditions prevail with additional losses. You will find that not only the same towns lose but in addition there are 20 towns which would lose from \$3 to \$2900 more.

Is this not a good illustration of the fact that the individual grange members knew nothing whatever of this school matter?

I have several men who are recognized as being at the top of their profession tell me they were surprised on studying up in this matter to see the mass of figures necessary to get any idea whatever, and then there was no proof that any change would be for the better.

I do not claim our present method gives an equal distribution, if it did there would be no need of the equalization fund.

Can you tell me of anything that is equal?

The Grange has failed to show us that their method is equal, why it was only claimed by one of the speakers the other day that 'it was only necessary for the proponents to show a certain degree of reasonable dissatisfaction in the distribution of these funds.'

Why a 'reasonable degree of dissatisfaction', is this a State or a local law?

The only proponents of this bill were here through the efforts of the Grange legislative committee.

They picked out 10 cities and towns

from a list of 520 and compared them with 17 small towns as an illustration.

Why 10 and 17? Why not 17 and 80, or any other figures that would suit their case?

They stated that more money would go into the small towns.

If so it would have to come from the cities principally.

I live in a small town but have some sympathy for the cities and I never heard of their wasting this school money.

Biddeford and Lewiston are held up as horrible examples, and it is a fact that there is an excess of school money but that is no excuse for changing the whole State law.

The Portland Press of Mar. 2nd shows clearly that Portland, Houlton, Farmington, Augusta, and Rockland would lose considerably by this bill.

These cities lose already, and do not complain, but they do object to the addition of any more burdens.

They stated that this was State money and if applied to schools should be used for the benefit of the "children of the State."

They were asked "who are the children of the State?" but failed to answer the question, presumably for the reason that the answer would not help their bill.

I should like also to ask the same question "who are the children of the State?"

If this bill should pass and those interested should follow out the answer to this question it would disrupt the whole school situation.

I understand the services of one of the local superintendents were obtained and that he worked from four to six weeks here in Augusta on figures relating to this bill, before it was presented and I wish to call your attention to one of the statements made and which I quote from the list as handed to me by him.

"That increased rate of taxation for local school purposes if the grange bill became a law would not be an unfair burden on towns and cities of the type represented by the list indicated.

This martyr list of towns and cities which should be sacrificed for the public good contains the following:

Auburn,	.50 to \$1.20
Lewiston,	.20 to 1.30
Portland,	.50 to 1.10
Winslow,	.00 to .50
Castine,	.80 to 1.60
Eden,	1.10 to 1.60
Skowhegan,	1.20 to 1.70
Sanford,	1.00 to 2.00
Biddeford,	.00 to 1.70
Bangor,	1.00 to 1.30

This increase of course being for school purposes only.

Why did he not list all the towns and cities that would suffer?

Presumably for the reason he would not gain many votes. I thought the object of this bill was to EQUALIZE school funds, NOT to raise tax rates.

Did you hear any admissions from them to the effect that small towns benefited from

Union Superintendence of which cities get \$5600, towns \$68,000.

Schooling children in unorganized townships, towns \$25,000.

Aid to High School, the towns and cities irrespective of size each get \$500.

Equalization fund \$50,000 of which the cities get not one penny.

Aid for industrial and agricultural work.

Aid to academies, and most of these are in the small towns.

All these things help the small towns.

Incidentally have you thought of the fact that in 1909 when this wild land tax was assessed, representatives from the small towns held the balance of power and voted for this and for the distribution of the money to the common schools, yet you are now asked to take away small sums from these towns and give it to others. To take from three counties in the State and give it to two and that when you are through you do not know whether this money has been distributed in a more equitable manner or not.

Because while figures have been made for 1916 you will find if you start with the figures of 1909 on a basis that this plan would not work out as stated. Therefore is there any reason to believe it would be any better in the future?

Those who have already voted on the basis of what their own town would get, instead of in a broad minded way, would be disagreeably surprised to see the result of the passage of this bill.

It is not a question of whether a certain town gains or loses or each town has peculiar conditions of its own. It hardly seems necessary for me to quote from the mass of figures at hand to prove the disadvantages.

I have listened vainly for three sessions for arguments that will prove any change necessary and it is hard for me to believe the proponents of this bill have the welfare of the State at heart.

We are sent here as servants of the State to do business for the State and we should not vote to change any law especially one of such vital interest to every person in the State as the distribution of this fund, unless actual figures can assure us that such a change is absolutely necessary and for the benefit of all.

Therefore I move that we non-concur with the House in acceptance of Report A and that we vote to accept report B ought not to pass, and when the vote is taken I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President, and fellow Senators:

"Though I speak with the tongue of men and of angels and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." The end of my fifth term of service as a member of the Committee on Education in the Legislature of Maine, is drawing to a close. (I was assigned to that committee the first term I served in the House. I was made Chairman of that committee on the part of the House during my second term there. I have been Chairman of that committee during the three terms which I have served in the Senate.) I can not tell you why I have been selected to serve on this committee, one of the most important, if not the most important of any committee within the gift of the Legislature, as it has to do not alone in the expenditures of large sums of money—more than one-half of the entire amount raised by the State by direct taxation, but it has to do with our boys and girls, our best product. That product which has made us proud of the Old Pine Tree State in the past and will continue to make us proud of Old Maine, until time for us will be no more.

I have no special qualifications for a position on this committee. I am not

even engaged in school work, and my business is entirely foreign to preparation for service. I think I have been chosen because of my love for the children and an honest desire that they might have the greatest opportunity to make the most of the best that is in them. In all my work on this committee, I have endeavored to ever keep in mind the child and not the dollar. The children must have protection, the dollars and the men who possess them will look out for themselves.

Our votes will be cast for or against this bill largely because of the view point from which we approach the subject. If we view it from the city or town, our vote will be cast for that method which will give the most money to the municipality in which we pay our taxes. By so doing, our towns will benefit a little financially and incidentally each senator who is taxed in those municipalities, and the Grange Bill will be defeated in this Senate 3 to 1.

If we approach it from the county view point, frankly acknowledging that we are the representatives of all the people in all the municipalities of the county from which we come, elected by them to protect their rights and interests, ever keeping in mind the greatest good to the greatest number, the Grange Bill will be passed in this Senate 3 to 1.

If we approach it from the political view point as to how it will affect the political fortune of each Senator, we are between the "devil and the deep sea." We will be damned if we do and we will be damned if we don't.

There is therefore nothing left for us to do but to take up the State wide position, viz. What method of distributing our common school funds will be the fairest, the most equitable and will produce the best results for the children in our entire State.

There is no public question before the people of Maine, in which they are more interested than this question of the distribution of school funds. The subject is an important one. It deals with the largest fund raised by the State for a single purpose and it affects vitally every city, town and plantation of the State. More than that it

affects every school child in Maine. It is a question that should be settled on no narrow ground of the interest of one town or community as opposed to those of another, but rather on the basis of equality and justice to the people of Maine as a whole, with special reference to the school children. It is from that point of view that I have endeavored to consider the merits and demerits of our present and the proposed method of distribution.

The proposed method of distributing our school funds reaches no child that is not in the common schools. It does not benefit the child out of school, or the child in the private school. Neither does the present method benefit children in either place. It also distributes the money where the children are, rather than where the dollars are.

Public opinion as expressed in recent Legislatures is crystallizing towards this kind of distribution. In the Legislature of 1913, the committee on education reported unanimously against the bill providing for distribution of the common school fund according to aggregate attendance in our common schools. In the Senate the report was unanimously accepted, in the House the report was accepted 86 to 40.

In the Legislature of 1915, the committee on education reported 9 to 1 against a similar bill. In the House on a ye and nay vote, the majority report was accepted 83 to 63. In the Senate on a ye and nay vote the report was accepted 22 to 6.

In the Legislature of 1917, the report of the committee on education was 5 to 5. In the House 75 voted for the bill and 70 against.

Let us consider for a moment the history of this State school fund. The first recognition of any State school fund in Maine was made in 1828 when provision was made for the creation of a permanent school fund to be derived from the sale of lands. At this early date the State recognized its obligations as a State to educate the youth. The income from this fund was to be distributed on the basis of the number of scholars and from that time, eight years from the beginning of our Statehood, to this date the census has been recognized as a basis for school fund

distribution. This State school fund was later augmented by the income from taxes on banks and from further sales of lands. The method of distribution remained the same.

Forty-five years ago the principle of a mill tax was first recognized, when the legislature of 1872 created a general tax of one mill on all the property of the State for the benefit of the common schools.

State school fund legislation continued without any important change or amendment from 1872 until 1907, a period of thirty-five years. Then a half mill was added to the general State tax for the support of common schools.

The legislature of 1909 created the common school fund by the assessment of one and a half mills on all the property of the State. The object of this new assessment seems to have been to reach the wild land owner. There was a decision of the courts that a special tax laid upon the wild lands would be unconstitutional. To get around or over this decision, a legislator in the high finance class devised the scheme to tax all the property of the State one and one-half mills and refund to the cities, towns and plantations this mill and one-half for the support of common schools, one-half mill according to census of scholars between five and twenty-one years of age, and the remaining one mill according to the valuation of the cities, towns and plantations. Those who were engineering this scheme did not pretend that they were especially interested in schools or school children, their minds were all taken up with the wonderful business stunt which they were putting over on the wild-land owner and incidentally the counties where that wild land was located.

Every one of those statesmen could go back home and tell the folks that our city is getting back one dollar ten for every dollar we put in to this common school fund. To be sure some counties are hit pretty hard by this deal, but we city statesmen in Cumberland, Kennebec and Androscoggin knew the high finance game better than those country fellows in Somerset, Aroostook, Piscataquis and

Franklin, and further we had the votes. Since this scheme has been in full swing, Somerset county has paid as its school tax in round numbers \$15,000 yearly more than she has received.

The source of the State school fund is unimportant as regards the discussion of this question. The present system of distribution of State funds, as I have said, is by two methods: one is valuation upon which one mill on the valuation of our State is distributed, the other is census of scholars between 5 and 21 upon which the other two mills are distributed. The bank tax, and the interest on the permanent school fund, is also distributed by census of scholars.

Speaking of the method of valuation, it is generally understood and generally conceded by everybody who is conversant with the subject that the valuation of a town or the valuation of a city has no relation whatever to the cost of maintenance of schools in that town or city. It may be that a town of five hundred thousand dollars valuation has as many scholars to care for as one of a million valuation.

Speaking of the census method the commission appointed by the legislature of 1911, reported that it was the least desirable. Mr. Stetson, a former State superintendent of public schools once said that in his opinion it was as fair to divide the school money according to the census of the pigs and cows on the farm as to divide it according to this method, which had nothing to do with school and the cost of maintenance.

Aggregate attendance means—If a child is in school one day that will count as a day's attendance. Adding the number of days attendance of each child in town gives the aggregate attendance for that town for the year. Aggregating the various towns of the State gives the aggregate attendance for the whole State. Dividing the school money by the total aggregate attendance would give the amount to which each day's attendance is entitled. Multiplying this by the aggregate attendance of a town gives the amount of money to which each town is entitled.

Each day's attendance in 1916 in accord-

ance with this plan would mean 99 cents. This is an incentive to the various towns to get their children into school as many days as possible.

It means the spending of our school money for children who are actually in school. It puts a bounty of nine cents per day upon the attendance of every child in the public school, and it is important that in conducting our public schools we try to save all the waste we can. It costs very little more to run a school with 30 pupils than it does with 10. The Russell Sage Foundation has this to say—"States which provide schools and neglect to keep them filled waste a considerable part of their revenues. A school with an average attendance of 10 pupils costs nearly as much as one with an attendance of 40. A mill equipped to grind 1000 bushels of wheat per day will make very expensive flour if it has to run all day on 100 bushels. Economic reasons, were there no others, are sufficient justification for compulsory attendance laws. True economy in public school administration consists in increasing production rather than in cutting down expenses." Because of this truth which is pertinent to all, the present bill provides that no school shall be reckoned as having less than 1500 days of aggregate attendance for the year.

Payson Smith, our former State superintendent of schools said that—"The principle underlying an aggregate attendance method of distributing school funds is sound and is one that ought to have the careful study of the people."

This method has been in force in New Jersey where they have a large State fund for many years. An observer of the workings of the law there has this to say, "The State fund is divided among the several school districts upon the basis of the total days attendance of all the children in the public schools during the year preceding that for which the apportionment is made. I believe this system to be theoretically correct, and its results are most satisfactory. The apportioning of school moneys on the basis of valuation does not appear to us to be either logical or satisfactory. The rates in the municipality bear no rela-

tion whatever to the cost of maintaining schools. A school district having a million dollars worth of taxable property may have as large a school population in school and need as many teachers as another district having three million dollars worth of property, and we believe one district is entitled to just as much State aid as the other. The effect of the law has been to increase not only the number of pupils enrolled but also the regularity in attendance. The fact that every day a child is in school means an appropriation by the State of from six to seven cents as an incentive to the district to see that the children are in school. It is one of the best compulsory education laws of which I have knowledge."

The commission appointed by the legislature of 1911, and to which I have already referred, said this in closing their report, "The plan of aggregate attendance including all schools and eliminating special aid to secondary schools for any purpose whatever is one that should invite the careful future consideration of our people."

Aggregate attendance in some form has the recommendation of a legislative commission of the highest character and ability. It is recommended by our former State Superintendent of Schools Payson Smith who is thoroughly conversant with conditions in Maine.

It works well in states where it has been tried. This bill is endorsed by the Maine State Grange, the only great organization of farmers in our State, the Pomona Grange, and nearly every subordinate Grange of the State. It is the one thing which they ask of this legislature.

I submit to you Mr. President that the rural sections of our State should be granted some consideration by this legislature. The people of those sections are among our best citizens. They form no small part of our commonwealth. Because of the scattered schools, many remote homes and the consequent high cost of conveyance, the cost per scholar for maintaining schools is large. The schools are not presided over by as experienced and high priced teachers as we find in the

large villages and cities. Many parents leave their farms and go to the cities because they want their children to have better school privileges. We need to have every farm in Maine populated. Nearly every farmer cares more for good schools than for any other privilege. This measure will help keep the present rural population on the farms.

There are many hard working men and women living in our cities receiving scarcely a living wage, who would get peace and plenty in the country for themselves and families. There are many abandoned farms that are calling for these occupants. Happiness is awaiting them there. Independence will be there. All the beautiful things in nature are there for God made the country, while man made the city. The country town is a beautiful place for an ideal home in which the little children may grow to manhood and womanhood, getting their education in the home and the little schoolhouse, becoming physically, intellectually and morally strong, the kind of men and women of which our State is justly proud. If we can do something that will make the country school better, our work here will not be in vain. God grant that we may be big enough to lose sight for a moment of all selfish interests.

As my home is in Skowhegan, it may be that my tax will be slightly increased and Senator Merrill's tax increased even more than mine, as he is the largest individual tax-payer in Skowhegan. But there are other towns in Somerset county, having many children and I am one of the senators from my county elected to protect her rights and help remove existing inequalities. The proposed method is fairer by \$3000 per year than the present method, although Somerset county would still be contributing in its three mill school tax,—\$12,000 more yearly than she would be receiving, and although it will cost me a few dollars more yet I pay my tax for the benefit of the public. I pay my town school tax for the benefit of the children in town. I pay my State school tax for the benefit of the children who are in the common schools of our State that are under public control.

In the present Maine Senate are 10

lawyers, four lumbermen, three general insurance agents, two merchants, two bankers, two physicians and druggists, a farmer and teacher, a coal dealer, a farmer, a merchant and banker, a civil engineer, and a lumberman and farmer.

Most of its members are from the cities and large towns, elected partly because of ability and popularity, partly because of the workings of the primary law, largely because of the rural vote. There are few members here whose homes are on the farm or in the small village, and whose principal business is conducted in the town where he has his home. There are 31 members of this Senate, 28 of whom are Republicans. Many of you are here because of the Republican majorities in the rural towns. Republican victories in the past for Maine have come because of the vote in the rural communities. They will come in the future because of that vote.

Can you, who owe your very existence as a senator, turn down the only request of these people, especially if that request is just, fair, equitable and right.

Under the present method the average amount received per child in common school from the State in 1915, was \$11.83. There were 44,000 scholars receiving above this average, and 89,000 scholars receiving below this average. The scholars receiving above the average lived in 77 of our richest towns and cities. The scholars receiving below the average lived in 376 of our towns and cities. Of these:

	Municipalities receiving	
	3 above	11 below
Androscoggin had	3	11
Aroostook "	1	47
Cumberland "	8	18
Franklin "	2	17
Hancock "	6	28
Kennebec "	5	24
Knox "	6	11
Lincoln "	3	14
Oxford "	8	27
Penobscot "	5	53
Piscataquis "	3	17
Sagadahoc "	4	7
Somerset "	3	22
Waldo "	2	24
Washington "	7	40
York "	11	15
	77	376

In conclusion, I wish to say,—If the present mode of distribution is unfair and theoretically wrong,—if the census

plan has outgrown its usefulness, and does not apply justly as we find conditions in Maine today,—if the valuation plan was formed outside of educational interests; and for selfish purposes, and the aggregate attendance plan appears to you to be fairer, I ask you to support this bill.

I believe the time is ripe for its passage. It comes to us as the one request of the farmers of Maine. They do not ask for any valuable franchise. They are not even appealing for themselves, but for their children. They ask no more for their children than they are willing to grant to all other children in our common schools.

This request appeals to me to be reasonable. It regards the State school fund as an educational fund, to be distributed to the scholars in school wherever they may be, and uses every scholar alike and this appeals to me to be right, and right in the end will prevail.

This senate may delay its coming but I believe that every senator here should be big enough to lose sight of selfish or local interests, and record his vote for the method of distribution which he honestly believes will be for the greatest benefit to the greatest number of children wherever they may be.

Mr. HOLT of Cumberland: Mr. President and fellow Senators: This is a most important question involving a change of distribution of the largest fund in the State coming through the State treasury. The latest figures give the fund as amounting to \$1,843,241.57. This is a question that affects vitally every town in the State of Maine. It should be considered on the basis of equity and justice to the people of the State as a whole. The proposed measure would make over the plan of distribution, and distribute this vast fund upon aggregate attendance in the common schools, the idea being, as it is advanced, that this placing the distribution upon attendance will stimulate attendance, and will mean that in the country towns and in the cities, the school authorities, anxious to get this money, will see to it that the boys and girls are kept in the schools. I believe that proposition has merit in it. But I want to point out that this proposed

measure, in the first place, does not distribute this fund according to the attendance in all schools. It pays no regard whatever to the high schools which are established in the towns and cities of our State. In the next place, it assumes, to start with, that all of this vast sum is an educational fund, which assumption is not true.

As has been stated here by Senator Ricker of Hancock, in giving the history of this measure, this is not an educational fund as to 1-2 mills; in its inception and origin it was not thought of as any such fund. While I will not take the time of the senate to go into the record of the debate when this measure was adopted, I will simply read, with your permission, a single paragraph from the chairman of the committee on taxation, which reported this measure in 1909: "In order that we may consider this amendment intelligently, it is necessary for us to consider the bill which is before the Senate. This bill has been reported by the committee on taxation for the purpose of imposing an additional tax upon the wild lands of the State. It is intended to satisfy in part at least the popular demands that the wild lands should contribute a larger sum to the expenses of the State, and that the wild lands should be taxed at a rate more in proportion to their valuation than is the case under the present law. The bill has no other purpose and it has no other intention. If it had been designed solely to create a larger fund for distribution among the cities and towns of the State for school purposes, I at least would not advocate its passage. It is designed solely to impose upon the wild lands of the State an additional tax."

The Senator who discussed the measure at that time, the Senator from Cumberland, Mr. Wheeler, who is and was a resident of the town of Brunswick, is corroborated in his position by the Senator from Somerset in his speech upon this measure two years ago, and I will read just briefly from Senator Walker's speech at that time: "I would call your attention especially to the fact that this second mill and a half was not levied in response to any demand for a larger State educational fund. No recommendation for a larger State fund for education had been made, no one so far

as I know, advocated before any legislative committee and no one in either branch of the Legislature spoke for the measure as primarily an educational one. . . This, I take it, was the reason for introducing a new feature of school fund distribution," referring to distribution as to two-thirds on valuation.

Here we have a vast fund which is collected from the owners of wild lands in order to equalize the burdens of government and it was received from them not as an educational fund at all. In the report of this committee which has been referred to already—this committee, which was composed of our honored Governor and men of the highest ability, men representing every phase of thought on this question—in their report they say, in one of their recommendations; "since the motive involved in the assessment of the last mill and a half common school fund was to procure income to the State from wild lands, that this motive should not be disregarded in any discussion relative to the present distribution of the funds so procured." And in their recommendations they say that the present method works fairly; they say it is doubtless true that for the majority of the towns the plan continues to be reasonably fair.

Before we attempt to embark upon an unknown sea and revamp the whole system of distributing this fund, we should determine that this new proposed plan is more equitable. One hundred and sixty-three of the towns would lose under this proposed plan, while half of the remainder would not gain materially. Of those towns which benefit by the equalization fund which has been alluded to here, amounting to \$50,000, seventy-five per cent of those towns would receive less under this proposed plan than they now receive. So that it is not all in favor of the smaller towns.

This is not a political question in any sense of the word, and politics should have nothing whatever to do with its decision. The larger towns and cities of the State should have their case presented here, not in any narrow spirit, but simply to show you, fellow senators, what the burdens are already upon the larger towns and cities. There

should be no arraying of city against town in this State in regard to this or any other question.

Under the present method 31 cities pay \$1,237,434 and receive back \$716,776. Under the present method 225 towns receive more from the school fund for the support of common schools than they appropriate for all purposes. The city of Portland pays into the common school fund today \$216,000 and receives back \$159,000, a loss of \$57,000. Bangor pays \$123,128, and receives back, \$55,712,—a loss of \$67,416. Lewiston pays \$97,000 and receives back \$68,000, a loss of \$29,000, Biddeford loses \$7,461.

Nor is this all of the burden of the larger cities and towns. The appropriation for school unions in 1917 was \$90,000 and the cities received back only about \$5,000 of this \$90,000. The normal schools, which we all believe in, and believe are for the benefit of the State of Maine, are given \$110,000. That benefits to some extent the country towns where they are located because they have the services of the teachers. The academies, practically all outside of the cities receive \$26,000. For free high schools, in 1917 the appropriation is \$145,000 and in 1918, \$146,000. Under these appropriations each municipality is given \$500 and no more. That is, no matter how large the community may be, that community can receive but \$500. In the city of Portland where we are building a high school costing a million dollars, with 2,200 pupils in the school today, this fund of \$500 on the number in the high school will give us twenty-five cents a head, whereas in some towns under this appropriation the towns would receive as high as \$25 a head. Out of this money that is appropriated for free high schools outside of the school fund, and in addition to it, Portland would pay 1-7 and would receive back 1-290; and Lewiston would pay 1-14 and receives 1-290; Bangor receives 1-290 and pays into the fund 1-12. We have heard about the burdens of the country town. Do you suppose that there are no burdens in the cities? In my own city, of the total tax paid, more than 50 per cent is paid by people of moderate means, and it is a hard struggle for many. Under this proposed plan, whereas we are now paying in \$57,000 more than we receive, this proposed

plan would impose an additional burden of about the same amount, about \$60,000. This money that we are paying out now, we do not begrudge at all, and we do not come here to make any complaint whatever. But we do say this, that before any system is changed, we should be sure that it is more equitable not only to the towns, but to the cities, and that the bill in its present form is not equitable to the cities.

The principle of school attendance is not embodied in this act to its full extent as it should be, that is, attendance in all schools. In the state of Washington, which is the state nearest to this proposed plan, where they raise some 35 per cent of the money through the state upon public lands, they return it upon attendance, but they include the high school and allow one and one-half for pupils in the high school. There is no state in the Union which has anything nearer approaching this proposed plan than the state of Washington. There is no city in the country that pays as much as the city of Portland for schools outside its city limits. I think that is a safe statement to make, this bill would increase our burden materially.

The debate of two years ago brought forth from the Senator from Somerset, Senator Walker, who now supports the bill, this statement: "I submit that while there is so small an understanding of the operation of the present method and so much less a consensus of opinion relative to any proposed plan we are not justified in enacting legislation which radically changes the distribution of three million dollars of public money within the next two years." He concludes, "Because the present method of distribution involving principles that are well established in the laws of the State going back nearly one hundred years; because some consideration is due to those localities that supported the wild land tax of 1909 and supported it as a tax measure and not as an education measure; because a recess committee of the highest ability found it impossible to agree on a better plan; because there is no apparent general public demand for a change in the method; and because this method which is before

you is extremely uncertain in its effect, I ask you to adopt the majority report of the committee on education," the majority report at that time being against the measure.

I marvel at the elasticity of the Senator's mind, as shown by his remarks of today; but I will say that I agree with his conclusions as stated at that time, that the original inception of this school fund was a tax measure, and that in distributing it we must be absolutely sure that the new method is more equitable than the old, and until some plan is presented which is more equitable than that proposed by the bill now before us, no change should be made.

Mr. BUTLER of Knox: Just a word, Mr. President and fellow Senators; I am not perhaps so solicitous as the Senator from Somerset, Senator Walker, for the future vote of the Republican party. I would agree with him that there were too many last year.

I am solicitous for any question that has to deal with the broad welfare of the State of Maine. I believe that there is no Senator here but who is big enough and broad enough, looking after the interests of his own county as well as he may, to see a vision of the whole State.

I do not think that the Senator from Somerset, Senator Walker, need fear that the Senate of Maine will not rise to the occasion and safe guard the best interests of the State of Maine. How am I placed coming from a small county and a small town? If the figures that have been prepared are correct the county of Knox would gain by this proposed change in the law about a thousand dollars. My own town would gain two or three hundred dollars. But what am I called upon to do as a Senator from the whole county and a Senator of the State of Maine? I would have to take nearly a thousand dollars away from Rockland, and nearly a thousand dollars away from Camden, and give it to some other locality. I would have to take several hundred dollars from one country town and give it to another.

I have not been able to see, after the

discussion of two years ago in this body—of which I was a member—and after the discussion this morning, that there is any larger measure of justice in the scheme of distributing this fund according to the aggregate attendance, than according to the system that now obtains.

I grant you, the Senator from Somerset, that there are inequalities in the present system, undoubtedly glaring inequalities, and inequalities that should be remedied, but until some scheme is devised that better rights those inequalities than the one now proposed I cannot support it.

Mr. President, I trust that the minority report will be accepted.

Mr. PEACOCK of Washington: Mr. President and fellow Senators: In considering any large proposition which affects the whole State of Maine we should feel that we of the Senate and House are the directors of the State of Maine, which is nothing more or less than a large corporation, and what laws we pass should be for the best interest of this corporation which we represent.

Now today we are called upon to consider one of the most important questions that can come before this board of directors; we have got to consider the development of one of the most important assets of the State of Maine, namely, the future education of our boys and girls, because upon the development of our boys and girls depends the future success of our State, for the boys and girls of today will be the men and women of tomorrow. Now in considering this question of this tax of three mills which is raised to help educate our boys and girls I feel we should look upon it not as to how it will affect any one section but what the result will be for the whole State, and I believe that each boy and girl should have his or her fair proportion of the money to help him or her to get an education, as the better education they can have the better citizens they will make and will have a larger ability to make the State of Maine a success. This State of Maine, or corporation, has got to compete against other states in our country,

and if these boys and girls are well equipped there can be no question about the success of our State.

There is no good reason that can be advocated why this money appropriated for the education of our boys and girls should not be equally divided among our different sections according to the aggregate attendance of our pupils at school. This is the only fair way to make the division of this money. There is no logical reason why a boy or girl living in some rural district should not receive the same proportional part of this money as does the boy or girl living in the city or large town; in fact, even if the money is equally divided in proportion to the average aggregate attendance the boy and the girl in the rural district does not get the same advantages as the boy or girl in the large cities because with the consolidation of larger schools in larger places they can be operated at less expense and the pupils get better advantages than in the rural districts where it is more expensive to operate the schools.

It has been argued by the opponents of this measure that certain cities and towns will lose a large amount of money should this bill be passed, but believe when they put this argument up that they are looking at it from a very narrow basis. It has been shown that the city of Portland will lose a large amount of money, also that Bangor will lose, that Lewiston will lose, and several other cities. Now I do not feel that it is a fair statement of facts that they will not lose anything. The city of Portland is in a large measure a trade centre; it cannot live by itself alone, it depends largely for its success upon the trade that it receives from the smaller towns and rural districts. I have listened all winter to the arguments in favor of why we should build good roads leading into Portland so that the people from the rural districts could come in there and market their products and spend their money, and I believe this is absolutely true and your Committee has been liberal in its recommendations for money that would improve

the roads leading into Portland, and whatever money the city of Portland may contribute towards the education of our pupils in rural districts is simply an investment that they are making to develop the assets of our rural districts, which is what the city of Portland in a large measure depends on.

Your worthy President appeared before the ways and bridges committee asking for an appropriation for roads leading into the city of Bangor, and he said, "I want to emphatically impress upon this committee that Bangor is a trade centre and it depends upon having good roads so that the people from Aroostook county, the people from Washington county and the surrounding counties can come in there to trade." Now if the City of Bangor is called upon to contribute any money to help educate the children in the outlying districts it is simply putting out money for which they will receive in return a hundredfold, because if the State of Maine is going to be successful in the future it has got to depend in a large measure upon the agricultural districts, and the better education we can give our children in the rural districts the more inducement we are going to make for them to stay home and the better the producing capacity they will have because it is demonstrated today that a man on a farm cannot follow the methods that he did 30 or 40 years ago. A man to make the agricultural business a success today has got to have an education and he has got to farm systematically. Now if the city of Bangor is called upon to contribute any money to help these boys and girls get a better education they are only investing money which will be returned to them a hundredfold later on.

There is another point in this law; it places a premium on our different cities and towns to encourage our boys and girls to go to school. Under the present law two mills of the money is divided by registration and one mill by valuation. Now this registration is taken in the spring of the year, and after that there is no in-

ducement to encourage a large attendance at school. We get the same amount of money whether our children go to school or not, but under this new bill where the money is divided by the aggregate attendance it is the business of every parent or everybody who is interested in the success of our towns to see that the aggregate attendance is good. This of itself is enough to warrant the passage of this bill.

There is a law upon our Statute Books whereby it was intended when passed that no city or town should receive this State money unless they contributed 80c for each inhabitant within the town, but some smart attorney has worded or changed the law so that it is not absolutely necessary to raise this 80c per pupil. The result is that with the distribution of this money some towns and cities are not raising any money at all. Take for illustration the city of Lewiston. It receives more money from the State than they can possibly spend on their schools and they at the present time have a large surplus on hand. The city of Biddeford also does not have to raise any money, and we should judge from the reports that they are having hard work to dispose of what money they are receiving from the State to support their schools. This does not seem to me to be a fair and just division of the money. In both of these cities the argument was brought forth that the reason why they did not need so much money was on account of the parochial schools, and in looking up the attendance of the city of Biddeford I find that it is only 23 per cent of the registration. Now ex-senator Murphy appeared before your committee and argued that nearly half of the pupils in the city of Biddeford were educated in parochial schools. Now even if this is a fact it would make over half the attendance less than 46 per cent, which is too low, and it demonstrates that they are not sending their children to school as they should. This same thing applies to Lewiston. But I believe that it would be practical and right that these parochial schools

should participate in the division of this money based on the aggregate attendance providing that their schools could be under some superintendence of the State showing that they were carrying out a certain line of studies. This would remove the argument wherever parochial schools were located and I believe it is nothing more than fair and just, as they are as much of an asset to the State of Maine in the future as any other pupils are.

A short time ago we were compelled to vote on a bill changing the distribution of the railroad tax. This would affect the larger cities and towns and would help the rural districts, but the arguments brought forth demonstrated that the present law was just and fair and that the amount of money received by the larger cities or towns on this particular bill was fair, notwithstanding the fact that our county and several other counties would be benefited by the law. Now we were honest in this as we are honest when we advocate that the school money be divided by the aggregate attendance, and we think that the Senators from the larger cities and towns that were benefited by having the distribution of the railroad tax remain as it was should see the justice of our position and help the rural districts in this particular case.

In any of the towns that show that they will make a loss by this aggregate attendance I believe it can be shown that the loss would be brought around largely by the short school year which would be lengthened under this aggregate attendance. The figures of loss and gain as shown under the present arrangement of distribution of school money would be altogether changed providing the money was divided on the basis of the aggregate attendance, and you would find that the towns that show now that they make a gain and the towns that lose would be altogether a different proposition, because I believe the officers of the towns and the parents would see that our aggregate attendance in the towns that lose would be changed and that the money would be more equally divided than it is at the present time.

Going back to the City of Portland which our friends have argued would lose over \$50,000, will say that accord-

ing to the figures I have today they raise less than \$27,000 for schools. This is less than 1-10 of the average school rate of the State. In your Committee hearing some member appearing against this bill brought up my own town, the town of Lubec, and said that he did not believe that we were looking for charity, that we were not paupers of the State, and, Gentlemen, we are not paupers of the State. We are only looking for justice. We raise for the support of our schools nearly one-half as much money as the City of Portland. Our valuation is only a million dollars and the City of Portland is over seventy millions of dollars. Now do you consider this a fair division of the money? Notwithstanding the fact that thousands upon thousands of dollars of our money go into Portland to help support the City of Portland, to help build their magnificent buildings, to buy the plate glass in their splendid stores, which I am proud of as any other citizen of the State of Maine is proud of them, but Portland is receiving the benefit from us and we in return are only asking them to be liberal with us and help to place our boys and girls on the same basis with their boys and girls, so that our children may be equally as well equipped to earn a livelihood and help make the State of Maine a success as theirs, and I believe it is nothing more than justice that we are asking for.

I believe that I can show a reason for every town in the State of Maine that would lose under this distribution of school money. It is one of four conditions. It is either the parochial schools, a high valuation brought around by our summer resorts and magnificent residences erected by non-residents, or a short school year which happens in many of our rural districts as our towns with what support they get from the State are not able to continue a 36 week term in low attendance. We believe if the 36 week term was established in all the towns it would change the division of this money materially, and, Gentlemen, if you want to be fair with the rural districts, if you want to help develop the State of Maine you want to accept this bill.

We have spent a lot of time this winter considering the preservation of

our water powers. Now our water powers are valuable, and nobody realizes that perhaps any better than myself, but, are the water powers of our State as valuable as the assets of our boys and girls who will be the men and women of tomorrow and on whom we depend for the success of our State of Maine? Gentlemen, I hope that you will vote to accept the report of the Committee whereby this money will be divided by the aggregate attendance.

Mr. DEERING of York: Mr. President, if it were necessary for any person to have a justification for speaking upon this particular question, I would simply have to call attention of the Senators to a list of figures I have here, showing what the effect of the proposed change would be upon York County.

I have heard this morning that this matter will be voted upon according to our various views. And I suppose the fact that the loss by aggregate attendance in the City of Biddeford being \$20,000, and the loss to York county being \$24,000, will be ample justification, according to the argument of the distinguished Senator from Somerset, that I should be in favor of Report B instead of Report A.

It seems that the situation is just about this: We have \$1,800,000 for school money, and there are, according to the present figures 236,000 children in the State. And all of those 236,000 children do not go to school, and therefore the proponents of this measure propose to guess that there are about 150,000 children who do go to school, and they propose to divide this million eight hundred thousand dollars, after some expenses are taken out, leaving \$1,543,000, they propose to divide that \$1,543,000 by 150,000, the average aggregate attendance rather than 236,000, which is the total number of scholars in the State of Maine between the ages of five years and twenty-one years of age.

It is very easy to see that when the aggregate attendance is used as the divisor, that some places will get more than they do now, while other places will get less than they do now.

Biddeford, which has been referred to in various ways this morning by various Senators, loses, as I say, almost \$21,000. It is strange to me how

any person can argue, even if Biddeford is not entitled to that \$21,000, that Starks or Lubec is entitled to any part of it. That \$21,000 is based upon the number of children between five and twenty-one in the city of Biddeford, whether they are Catholic or Protestant, and it is strange to me that Lubec and Starks, or any other city or town, should claim that we should raise the children of Biddeford and have this money divided up according to the aggregate attendance; because, as has been well said by the Senator from Cumberland and argued by him in regard to the history of the case, it will be seen that this bill prepares a way for a vast injustice to be done to the city and towns as they now are.

It is said that this measure is a Grange measure, and it is urged here very earnestly that the Grange have the one thing that they ask for. I do not know that there are any towns better fitted to carry on Grange work in the State of Maine than Dayton, Eliot and Hollis, which lose about \$1000, and Limerick and Lyman which lose about \$600 by this proposed change. It is evident that when you change the distribution of this school money to what is proposed in Report A, you take away from these towns, which are Grange towns, just the same as you take away from towns which are not Grange towns. It is evident that the Granges in those particular towns were not consulted when this bill was brought before the Legislature, because this bill would mean that almost a thousand dollars should be taken away from Dayton, Eliot and Hollis and given to Kennebunk, Kennebunkport and Kittery. I do not want to take the responsibility of saying that Dayton, Eliot and Hollis shall not receive their proportion of the money on the amount of children they have now, and that Kennebunk, Kennebunkport and Kittery shall have it.

The distinguished Senator from Somerset has said, "God made the country and man made the city." But I do not think that gives the Grange a license to take possession of everything that God made and leave us in the cities to prevent the Grange from committing race suicide.

Now the political expediency of this matter has absolutely nothing to do with it. No man in this Senate, I believe, votes with any expectation that he is going to get more votes at home for his particular action on any particular thing here. And I do not believe it should be taken into account that any political expediency attaches to this bill.

It has been asked by the Grange that they have this bill because it is the only thing they want. What can the Grange do, it is asked, if they do not get this particular bill? I have noticed that this Legislature has been conspicuous by the absence of many prominent farmers and grangers of the State. They should have been here. They should have been here to encourage the raising of cattle, sheep and horses, which have decreased thousands and thousands in numbers during the last twenty years. That is a thing that the Grange could do if it came here and tried.

It has been argued in all seriousness that this particular bill is going to be a more equitable bill. As I said before, there is nothing equitable for us to arbitrarily take away from the cities and towns that are now enjoying this fund and give it to some other cities and towns. And as the gentleman from Lubec, Mr. Peacock, says that he contributes some to the advantages of Portland and Bangor, still Bangor and Portland would contribute—and Biddeford as has been mentioned here—would contribute a thousand times as much for the benefit of the towns of the State if the distribution of this fund was changed, than they do at the present time. I believe that we have a right principle at the present time, and I believe that this is at the wrong stage of our period of legislation to change this particular method. We have at the present time no head of that great department of schools, which expends \$1,800,000—there is no superintendent of public schools at the present time. One man carries that whole department on, and while there is nothing said about his competency, because everybody believes he is perfectly competent to carry it on, still it is too much of a load to put on

one man to carry on a big State department that expends \$1,800,000. And when we have a new superintendent of schools, if we ever do have one, that new superintendent of schools must learn all the various things that are connected with the department in order to better carry it on. It will take him at least a year or two to learn the things he must learn to carry that department on, and at the present time to change the whole system of our division of the public fund and load it on to the one man who carries it on now, or upon the new superintendent who may come, would not be doing it at the time when it was proper and for the best interests of the State.

Mr. GOOGIN of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I heartily agree with a good deal of what the senator from York, Senator Deering, has said, but I feel called upon to correct an error, I think, of Senator Peacock's. I am on the school board of the city of Lewiston, and this is the first time that I knew that we had more money than was necessary to run our schools. I believe he said that there was a surplus. If there is a surplus, I have never been able to see it.

It seems to me that if a redistribution of school funds were to take place in the State of Maine, it should take place in a way that it will not hurt one locality and benefit another, but hurt and benefit each locality in the same proportion. As Senator Walker has said, sometime in this Senate a law will be passed on the redistribution of school funds. I do not believe that law will ever be passed until it is an equitable law, a law that will treat all the cities of our State alike. In listening to a number of the remarks, the impression that they have given seems to be that most of the children are in the country. I can assure you there are a lot of children growing up in the city of Lewiston, and I expect them to be good law-abiding citizens and certainly as much entitled to an education as those that live in the country. It seems to me that the prosperity of a city and the prosperity of the country that surrounds that city is a community of interest; that is to say, that if

the city prospers so the country will prosper, and as the country farming districts prosper so will the city.

Mr. President and Senators, I move you that Report B be accepted.

Mr. AMES of Washington: Mr. President, I am rather diffident about standing before this Senate with its many senators skilfully trained to debate.

If all my fellow senators could go with me to one of our logging camps on the Machias River, after we had two plates of good beans, some of those large, steaming biscuits and big, brown doughnuts with a dish of boiled tea, we would sit about the camp fire, fill our corn-cob pipes, take our jack-knives and get a nice piece of pine. I would only have to whittle a small piece of wood before I could convince a large majority of my fellow senators that the Washburn Bill—known as House Document No 131—"An Act to provide for the distribution of State school funds available for the support of common schools" is the grandest piece of legislation that has been presented to the Legislature of Maine in a great many years.

But I must adapt myself to the present situation and I am glad to stand here and express my views.

Maine is a rural State. Early in its history, its statesmen saw that a State School Fund was necessary since education is a responsibility of the entire State and the support should provide equality of opportunity to all the children, whether they live in a wealthy or a poor town. First, a permanent school fund was made from the sale of land in 1828, 1855 and 1857; the interest "to aid towns according to the number of scholars therein". Second, tax on savings banks; third, tax on trust companies. Later, it was voted that a tax of one and one-half mills on a dollar should annually be taxed on all property in the state according to the value thereof—for the support of the common schools. This tax is now known as the School Mill Fund. This fund shall be distributed by the Treasurer of State on the first day of December, annually, to the several cities, towns and plantations according to the number of schol-

ars therein, as the same shall appear from the official return made to the State Superintendent of public schools for the preceding year. Any amount unexpended shall be added to the permanent school fund.

In 1909, a tax of one and one-half mills on a dollar was voted to be annually assessed upon all the property in the State according to the valuation thereof and is known as the common school fund or wild land tax. One-third of this fund is to be distributed in the several cities, towns and plantations according to the number of scholars therein, and two-thirds according to the valuation thereof. The Maine school fund was created in part as an educational fund, and in part through an effort to devise a scheme of taxation which would reach the wild land area. Many representatives voted in favor of the enactment of the last school tax bill as a taxation and not as an educational measure. All other school funds were originally created as educational funds, and a basis of distribution should be found that will be as nearly as possible purely educational.

It is the tendency of both wealth and population to flow into the cities and large commercial centers. For instance, the town of Windham in Cumberland county, the birthplace of Gov. Andrews, the great war governor of Massachusetts, in the year of 1860 had a population of 2635 and thirty years later had only 2216, a falling off of 16 per cent, while in the city of Portland, only twelve miles away, in 1860 had 26,341 inhabitants and in 1890 36,425, an increase of 40 per cent. The town of Livermore in Androscoggin county, the birthplace of C. C. Washburn, once governor of Wisconsin, and the head of one of the largest flour mills in the world, also the birthplace of the Hon. Elihu Benjamin Washburn, a noted statesman and diplomat, in 1850 had a population of 1764 and in 1910 had only 1100, a falling off of 60 per cent. Buckfield, in Oxford county, the birthplace of the Hon. John D. Long, once governor of Massachusetts and one of the most efficient secretaries of the navy, had in 1860 a population of 1705 and in 1910 only 1087, a falling off of

36 per cent. I might go on indefinitely stating instances of small towns that have given the early education to great men but have been sapped of their population.

So it is only fair to adopt a reasonable device for the return of wealth to its source. The prosperity of a state depends not only upon the industrial prosperity of the cities and larger towns, but upon the general dissemination of prosperity throughout the State. If, by reason of inferior school facilities, people are discouraged from living in smaller towns and rural sections, not only those sections will suffer but also the cities which they commercially feed. Since many children being educated in the rural sections of the state will naturally become citizens of other towns, it is not unfair that the cost of educating them be borne in part by the places of which they will later become residents.

The Washburn bill does not ask that an extra amount be given the rural communities but the schools in every district in the State shall receive an amount according to the number of scholars attending and the number of weeks of schooling. This will be an incentive to make the average attendance greater in the rural communities.

As I look about the Senate Chamber, I see the brilliant Senator from Cumberland, Sen. Davies, who, by his indomitable courage, hammered his way to the bar; the eloquent Senator from Penobscot, Sen. Gillin, who was educated in the country schools of Aroostook and has adopted Bangor as his home. I see Senator Gillin is out today. I wish he were present. The chairman of our educational committee, Sen. Walker, who was born in New Portland and attended the Little Red School House on the Hill; and my friend, the Senator from Hancock county, Sen. Wood, who battled with the elements in the shore town of Gouldsboro to secure his education.

I could go on almost forever and refer you to the great men of our cities who were educated in rural communities at the expense of poor towns, and if this bill should cut some of the school fund from Portland, Bangor, Lewiston and other business centers,

these communities should be glad to contribute to the villages that have furnished them not only with business but with men who have the capacity to meet larger conditions.

Upon what does the business prosperity of this great United States depend? Is it New York city? Is it Chicago, New Orleans, San Francisco? Oh, no. They are side issues. In the fifties, the El Dorado was California gold. Today it is California fruit, Columbia River salmon, Washington apples, Oregon pine. Were it not for the great wheat fields of the west, there would be no wheat pit in Chicago. Were it not for the Texas steers and the cornfields of Iowa and Nebraska there would be no Cudahy or Armour packing houses. Were it not for the sugar cane of Louisiana and the cotton fields of the south, there would be no New Orleans. I could go on at greater length to demonstrate that these trade centers all depend on the products of the soil, farming and grazing first, and natural resources second.

There would not be any Wall Street in New York without all these. So it is an axiom that the big business of the nation depends first of all on the agricultural pursuits. All other business is secondary and the large business centers the last of all. As it is in the nation, so it is in the grand old State of Maine. Its forests and water powers attracted the early settlers and as long as there are large agricultural communities, there will be prosperity. Where would Bangor be today were it not for its great commerce with Aroostook, Piscataquis, Hancock and Washington counties? Where would it be without the great commercial benefits arising from the University of Maine, the woolen mills in Old Town and the factories of Penobscot county? As a manufacturing city, it is surpassed by Brewer. Therefore, as an economical measure, it is the duties of the citizens of Bangor to do all they can to keep up the farming communities that supply them with produce and trade. The most efficient way to accomplish this is to supply those communities with just educational facilities.

I won't take up the time of this Senate to draw similes of Augusta, Lewiston and other cities of the State.

But I will remind my friends from Portland, the Clearing House of the State, that they owe a big debt to rural Maine for their commercial life, their real estate and large banks. I am glad to see every city of Maine prosperous but unless the residents of the city are wise and allow the educational facilities in the rural sections to be on a par with the larger centers, they will be responsible for their undoing. Therefore, by assisting education in the rural towns, you make them more inviting to live in and at the same time receive the dual advantage of the farm trade and products.

The distribution of an educational fund should be based upon some plan whereby the money will reach children actually in school. The plan of aggregate attendance, probably more nearly than any other, secures this result.

The Washburn Bill provides this. "The aggregate attendance of scholars in a town shall be determined by the State superintendent of public schools by adding the total number of days each pupil was in actual attendance, provided that attendance of each regularly enrolled pupil shall be counted for each school holiday, for each day of the school year when there was no session of school because of the absence of the teachers in attendance on teachers' meetings as provided by law, for not more than one day in each term when there was no session of school because of the absence of the teacher in visiting other schools when so authorized by the superintending school committee, and for each day of the school year, not to exceed a total of fifteen days in any one school year, when there was no session of school by order of the proper authorities because of the prevalence of an epidemic or because of the unfitness of the school building from the effects of fire or other unpreventable cause, provided such loss of sessions is not afterward made up. For all schools lawfully established and maintained there shall be reckoned a minimum of aggregate attendance of fifteen hundred days, etc."

According to the School Laws of Maine, Section 66, Chapter 16, "Every child between the seventh and fifteenth anniversaries of his birth, and every child between the fifteenth and seven-

teenth anniversaries who cannot read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language, shall attend some public day school during the time such school is in session."

According to Section 20 of Chapter 16, "The school moneys of every town shall be so expended as to give as nearly as practicable the same aggregate annual length of terms in all its schools, and every town shall make provision for the maintenance of all its schools for not less than thirty weeks annually."

According to the report of the town of Machias for 1916, there were between the ages of five and twenty-one years, 630 persons. From this number, 452 attended the common schools. Why should the town of Machias or any other town in the State receive aid from the State for those 178 pupils who are not attending the common schools? According to the last report, the school attendance in Machias was 86 per cent and how much greater is the evil in communities that are receiving the full amount of refund from the State, according to the present system, and only show a 40 per cent average attendance?

Why should towns and plantations that only have the minimum number of weeks of school receive the same amount from the State school funds as the city or town that has thirty-two, thirty-four and in some cases thirty-six weeks of school? Why should cities and towns receive school money from the State for pupils who do not attend the public schools? According to the Washburn Bill, each scholar will receive the amount as the aggregate attendance shows.

The school census method originally adopted was, at the time of its adoption, not unfair, since, at that time, there were no industrial centers and few or no private schools. The school population was in reasonably accurate proportion to school attendance throughout the State. As industrial centers have developed, creating unequal conditions of school attendance, and as private schools have increased in enrollment, a school census plan ceases to have the same value as an educational basis.

In passing, I want to call the attention of the senate to the discussion of February 14th regarding "An act re-

lating to application for admission to the bar" which was so ably discussed by several senators of the legal fraternity. I wish to call senator Holt's attention to his plea for certain educational qualifications before a person could even apply to the state board of examiners for admission to the practice of law. And to senator Merrill's endorsement by referring to the necessary qualifications for a person to practice medicine. It is in behalf of the country lad and lass I now plead for equality in opportunity as far as possible with the boy or girl who is fortunate enough to live in communities where there are more educational advantages. I also refer to the remarks of the able chairman of the judiciary committee, Sen. Davies, in his plea for the poor boys who did not have the opportunities of a common school education. I appeal to the senate to vote to enable the "Barefoot boy with the crownless hat and with the tag of sunshine on his breast" so eloquently portrayed by Sen. Gillin in a speech last week—to have an equal opportunity for education as the boy more fortunate who is living in the larger places of ease and affluence.

It is for the Abraham Lincolns, the John Marshalls, the William McKInleys and hosts of others I am pleading and I am reminded of the quotation from Gray's Elegy:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean
bear;

Full many a flower is born to blush un-
seen,

And waste its sweetness on the desert
air."

And fellow senators, there is many a boy and girl on the farms in the sparsely settled communities of good old rural Maine who should, at least, have an equal amount of the school fund at their command so their educational "sweetness" may be disseminated to its best advantage.

Mr. President, I quote the following from your sound, logical speech of acceptance of your office, "Some of our brother legislators at the other end of the corridor no doubt will have a peculiar or local interest. And perhaps some of the Senators, when in

the House at that time, had a peculiar local interest. It seems to me that the people of our state expect senators to take a much broader and more comprehensive view than one merely local. The fact that you represent a county speaks for that. And in the legislation presented to us, it seems to me that we should adopt that broad and comprehensive view."

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the motion of Sen. Ricker to accept report B "ought not to pass" will not prevail and when we vote we will remember the language of Abraham Lincoln.

"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."
(Applause.)

Mr. HOLT: Mr. President, if I may be allowed just one word. I understood the senator from Washington, senator Peacock, to say that Lubec, his home city, raised half that Portland raised for local purposes. Now if that was the statement, I wish to say that I find in the report of Portland that \$41,600 was raised by the city for local school purposes, and in Lubec \$3000.

Mr. MARSHALL of Cumberland: Mr. President: I do not rise to enter into the debate. I think the Senate has re-established its reputation as a deliberative body. I simply want to bring out clearly the fact that for all school purposes the city of Portland pays out \$360,000 and receives from the state \$167,000. In other words, it leaves in the state treasury \$193,000. The proposed bill, Report A, would, as I understand it, also take from the city of Portland a further sum of \$57,000, and by the same token Bangor for all school purposes pays out \$123,000 and receives from the state \$55,000, leaving a net balance to the state of \$68,000. I might go on with other cities and large towns in the same way. I simply want to bring these facts clearly before the senate, and I second the motion for the adoption of Senate report B.

Mr. DAVIES of Cumberland: Mr. President, the distinguished senator from Cumberland, senator Marshall, says that he thinks that the Senate has re-established its reputation as a deliberative body. I only desire to say that I did not know that it had ever lost that reputation.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of Senator Ricker that we non-censure with the House in the adoption of Report A on this bill, and that we do adopt Report B.

Senator Ricker called for the yeas and nays.

A sufficient number arising the yeas and nays were ordered and the secretary called the roll.

Those voting yea were: Messrs. Bartlett, Baxter, Butler of Knox, Butler of Franklin, Chick, Conant, Davies, Deering, Googin, Gordon, Grant, Hastings, Higgins, Holt, Lord, Marshall, Merrill, Ricker, Swift, Wood—20. Those voting nay were: Messrs. Ames, Boynton, Burleigh, Davis, Fulton, Peacock, Peterson, Stanley, Walker—9.

Absent: Mr. Gillin.

Twenty senators having voted in the affirmative and nine in the negative the motion of the senator from Hancock, Senator Ricker, prevailed and the Senate adopted Report B, ought not to pass.

On motion by Mr. Davies of Cumberland a recess was taken until 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

After Recess

The PRESIDENT: The Senate will please be in order. We will resume consideration of the matters which were specially assigned for today. The first matter assigned for today is H. D. 579, An Act to incorporate the Independence Developing Company of Kingman, tabled by Mr. Lord of York.

On motion by Mr. Lord, tabled and assigned for next Thursday morning.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate H. D. 613, Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes, seminaries and colleges for maintenance and for repairs and improvements, tabled

pending adoption of Senate Amendment A to House Amendment A.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President: The part of the resolve for academies, institutes, seminaries and colleges, which the amendments seek to change, has relation to Lee Academy, an institution of learning in the town of Lee, Penobscot county. The committee on education reported in favor of \$750 for 1917 and \$500 for 1918. In addition the academy would receive under the general academy law \$500 for each of the years 1917 and 1918 if their average attendance was 30 or more, \$750 for each year if their average attendance was 60 or more and they maintained a classical and an English course of study as prescribed by the State superintendent of schools, and \$1000 for each year if they had an average attendance of over 60 pupils and maintained in addition a training course for teachers.

There is another academy eight miles from Lee Academy, in the town of Springfield, known as the Eastern Maine Institute. Your committee reported favorably for this school \$750 for 1917 for furnishing and equipping school building and \$500 for reimbursement for 1916.

This was \$2500 for these two academies—serving the same territory, and in addition they would receive under the general law nearly, if not quite as much, and possibly more.

In the early days of the legislature, we heard a good deal about the Budget. Many hearings were held before committees having charge of appropriations. Progress seemed slow. Time was passing. In the fourth week of this session, the committee on education had a budget hearing. Notices were sent by the executive department to most of the schools, which had already asked for an appropriation, for a hearing on a certain day. Many of these schools did not get their notices in time to appear at the hearing. Some of the schools were represented at the hearing, some were not.

When your committee met in executive session, we were not in a position to report on the type of school of which Lee Academy is one. Resolves for other academies had been introduced into the

legislature, but were not in the hands of the committee. Other resolves would be introduced. We didn't know how much money we would be allowed for all the academies. We wanted to be fair to all and grant special privileges to none. We therefore reported to the Governor, that we could not fairly and intelligently act on the matter at that time. We were asked if we should report more than was requested by the different schools and we replied that we should not. The next day the Budget appeared recommending \$2000 for Lee Academy for instruction for each of the years 1917 and 1918, this was the amount asked for for St. Joseph Academy \$1500; for Van Buren College \$1000; for Higgins Classical Academy \$1000; for North Yarmouth Academy \$500; Litchfield Academy \$500; Madison Institute \$250. The committee on education after due notices, and hearings on the different schools, reported ought to pass for the amounts carried in the resolve under discussion. This report went to the House and comes back amended by the Lee Amendment. It is said that the House deliberated upon this proposition and that some of its members deliberated, orally you know the House is a Great Deliberating Body. How do you know? why some of the members who do much of the deliberating say so.

The reasons given in these vocal effusions for the increase, were "We are it." And as a clincher—The budget, recommendations of the Governor. It was steam rolled through the House, not giving a moment's thought to the other schools appearing in the Budget, or out of the Budget. If the Budget recommendations are to be taken as against the recommendations of the committee. Why not take all the recommendations in the Budget and reject all the recommendations of the committee. If the budget report on this type of school, hastily made is everything, and the report of the committee after careful thought and investigation, is nothing, our hearings on the different schools have been nothing but a farce.

From the 1916 report of Lee Academy, we find

State Appropriation,	\$1,500.00
Tuition,	1,248.00

Fees,	\$4.00
Income from Invested Funds,	150.00
	<hr/>
	\$2,982.00
Expenses	
Teachers salary,	\$2,558.00
Janitor,	69.59
Books, etc.,	298.30
Repairs,	9.55
Insurance,	101.10
Officers salaries,	62.00
Canvassing,	101.75
	<hr/>
	\$3,000.20

Resolves of 1915:

\$1500 each year for Instruction
500 each year liquidation of indebtedness on dormitory.

For some years previous to 1901, there was a general scramble by academies for special appropriations. In that year the General Academy Bill was passed. From 1901 to 1911, Lee Academy received \$1000 per year from the State for instruction, in addition they received \$1000 in 1907 for the repair of boarding house and in 1909 they received \$1500 on payment of debt.

In the Plaisted administration, there was a general cut in all appropriations. The pruning knife was freely used by a Master Mind. Lee Academy was cut down from \$1000 per year to \$750 per year, at least the committee on education and the entire legislature thought so, even when they adjourned, but those boys from Lee Academy still had the goods and went home with an increased amount, having hoodwinked even a Democratic administration, which is going some.

The error was laid at the door of the clerk of the committee on education. However, Lee Academy got the dough.

She came before the legislatures of 1913 and 1915 and said she couldn't possibly get along with less than \$1500 per year for instruction, the amount received in 1911 and 1912. It was granted. In addition \$500 for each of the years 1915 and 1916 for liquidation of debt. We were helpless when up against these masterful men.

It has always been the intention of the legislature to attach a rider to each resolve in favor of Lee Academy for instruction, precisely like the last part of my amendment. It is because of this custom and as a safeguard for the State that I offer it as a part of my amend-

ment,—increasing at the same time the amount of the resolve to \$1500 per year for instruction, which is as large an amount as has ever been granted to this school for a like purpose.

It was supposed by everybody that this rider was on the resolve passed in 1915. I say everybody, there is a mysterious exception somewhere and the resolve for Lee Academy appears without the rider, however she has not received money under the general academy law during the past two years.

I will say that in considering the resolves for the academies the committee on education wanted to be fair to all the academies of the State. If we were to have \$25,000 or \$30,000 for two years, we wanted to take that sum and distribute it among the different academies where in our judgment it would be of the most benefit.

We could not give one academy more that was doing precisely the same work than another academy, and treat them justly.

So when we decided on the amounts, something like \$25,000 for two years, we put that amount where in our judgment it would do the most good.

The committee on education would like to have more money for all the academies. It would have liked to have the amount gradually raised every year, but if it was to be raised for one, to be just to the others it seemed best for it to be raised for the others.

Therefore I move that an amendment granting \$1500 for each of the years 1917 and 1918, which is as large as the Lee Academy has ever received, be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HIGGINS of Penobscot: Mr. President, in order that my fellow Senators may be fully acquainted with the House and Senate Amendments I respectfully ask the Chair to read House Amendment A and also Senate Amendment A.

The PRESIDENT: House Amendment A to House bill 613. Said resolve relating to Lee Academy is hereby amended on page 2 by striking out the words "\$750", and substituting therefor the words "\$2,000".

Senate Amendment A, to House Amendment A. relating to Resolve in favor of Lee Academy at Lee as contained in House Document No. 613.

Amend by substituting in place of the words "two thousand dollars" the words "fifteen hundred dollars" in both sections of said amendment, so that said resolve as amended shall read as follows for the year 1917 'Lee Academy, Lee, for the payment of instructors, fifteen hundred dollars' and for the year 1918, 'Lee Academy, Lee, for the payment of instructors, fifteen hundred dollars.'

Further amend by adding to said amendment the words "Provided, however, that said institution shall not be entitled to any aid from the State for the years 1917 and 1918 in addition to that carried by this resolve."

Mr. HIGGINS of Penobscot: Mr. President and Fellow Senators: The distinguished committee on education of whom my friend, Senator Walker, is chairman, have had many matters come before them for their consideration. And it is only fair to this committee for me to say that possibly in the exercise of their judgment upon these various matters, it is possible that they may have over-looked the particular merits of some particular school or academy, as the case may be.

The town of Lee is located fifty miles from the city of Bangor, 33 miles by rail and 12 miles by team. This academy is one of the few academies in the State of Maine that in my opinion is entitled to special consideration by this or any other legislature.

In 1911 they were granted \$3,000, \$1500 for each of the two years; in 1913 the same amounts, and in 1915 the same. This school has for many years received special consideration at the hands of the legislature on account of the excellence of its work. It maintains a teacher's training corps and the teachers of that school are found in and about that vicinity, where it is impossible to secure school teachers to take up the work. Its work is not confined to the town of Lee.

Out of the present registration of 65, 28 come from other towns. Now the

ability of this town to contribute is absolutely remote. Lee has a valuation of \$150,000. It raises this year for general school purposes \$1,850, which is a very large amount, gentlemen, as you look at its valuation.

The tax rate is 36 mills, 36 mills on an average valuation, and no prospect of a lower rate. The town debt at the present time is about \$1500, and it, must contract a further indebtedness of \$1500 for a new school house.

The academy debt—in June, 1916, a careful audit was made of the institution and the debt was found to be \$3500. In 1915 this academy received from the Honorable D. D. Stewart of St. Albans \$6,000 with the condition attached that only the interest would be used.

Mr. Stewart, as you well know, makes his gifts to only those schools which in his opinion are of a high standard, and this speaks volumes for Lee Academy.

Article 9 of the Constitution of Maine commends the legislature to provide for academies and other institutions of learning. Shall this legislature do less in this respect than previous legislatures?

Gentlemen, this Lee Academy needs this \$500 extra to pay for instruction and to take its place among the academies in this State. I want to say to you that it gave me a great deal of pleasure, when my friend, the distinguished Senator from Cumberland, said this morning in his argument on the other bill that it was to help out the country boys and girls. That is exactly what this appropriation will do if you grant the school the extra \$500.

Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Senate, I trust Amendment A, introduced by my friend, the Senator from Somerset, will not receive a passage.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I have no doubt that the children that attend the Lee Academy are worthy; I have no doubt that the Lee Academy is doing splendid work, but the children attending school in Waldo County, Freedom Academy, the Anson Academy or the Hartley Academy, or the Limerick Academy, or any of the academies of the State of Maine are worthy

of our consideration, and they have a right to expect at our hands equal treatment.

While I would favor almost any amount for educational purposes for any particular academy, yet I believe we should be as fair to the other academies, as fair to the other children that attend the other academies.

When your committee on education considered this type of school they did not consider them so much in regard to organization as academies as we did consider them for the service they were doing for the children in those particular locations. And the children in the other counties of the State, attending other academies, are doing as splendid work and will be heard of in the future the same as the children in the Lee Academy. We ask that the same treatment be accorded to the other academies as is accorded to the Lee Academy.

If it is the sense of this Senate that the appropriation be doubled, I will hold up both hands for the doubling of all the appropriations. If it is the sense of the Senate that this amendment pass, why not pass an amendment also for the Saint Joseph Academy and the Van Buren College. Although Catholic schools they are recommended by the Governor, and I will not stand for an increase in this appropriation unless we stand for an increase in the appropriations for those schools. I know that those institutions are doing splendid work for the State of Maine and are entitled to such consideration as we give other academies that are private institutions.

Therefore, Mr. President, if it is the sense of this Senate that this resolve be increased, I do trust that the Senate will take a fair view of the academies in the other counties in the State and treat them likewise.

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. President, just a word more and I will close. I want to say that if a like condition obtained anywhere else in the State as obtains at Lee, I for one would be glad to increase any appropriation made.

Something has been said in regard to the Budget System. The amount I asked for under this resolve was

passed by the House, and it was recommended by the Governor.

I would move, Mr. President, and Senators, the indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment A to this bill.

The pending question being on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, that the Senate indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment A to House Amendment A of this resolve, a viva voce vote was taken and the motion was adopted.

The pending question now being on the adoption of House Amendment A in concurrence, on motion by Mr. Higgins the amendment was adopted.

Mr. BURLEIGH of Aroostook: Mr. President, I offer Senate Amendment B to House bill 613.

Amendment B

Amend the items:

For maintenance and equipment of Van Buren College by changing from five hundred dollars for each of the years 1917 and 1918 to one thousand dollars for each of said years.

Mr. BURLEIGH: Mr. President, this college at Van Buren is doing excellent work and it needs the full appropriation the same as it has had for the last two years, \$1000 each year. The recommendation in the Budget is for \$1000 each year, recommended by the Governor, and I am satisfied that in order to do the excellent work they are now doing there that they should have \$1000 each year, and I hope the Senate will so vote.

I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I second the motion of the Senator from Aroostook.

The motion was agreed to and Senate Amendment B was adopted.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I also offer an amendment to the amount recommended for Saint Joseph's Academy.

Mr. GILLIN of Penobscot: Mr. President, I second the motion of Senator Walker.

The PRESIDENT: The President cannot entertain a motion for an amendment unless it is in writing.

(Tabled on motion by Mr. Walker.)

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I also move that the appropriation for the academy in Waldo county, Freedom Academy be increased from \$500 a year to \$1000 a year.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator will put his amendment in writing.

Mr. WOOD of Hancock: May I ask the Honorable Chairman of the educational committee and others, why, if we are going to stand by this program, why we do not do it? If we are going to give one academy a thousand dollars a year, I want a chance to look this over and see if there are not some others that want it. I am willing to take the report of the committee except in exceptional cases. I am willing to be just as liberal as anyone in this Senate, but I do not believe we should take the stand because someone says I am from Hancock county and there is some school down there that ought to have a thousand dollars that they should have it. Within two or three minutes there have been two or three amendments increasing the amount of appropriation, because somebody else got something.

My county may think I am delinquent in my duty if I do not go after something.

It occurs to me if a man comes out and asks for a whole lot he is able to get something. I do not believe in that policy. If there is any particular reason why these schools should have more money I am willing to stand for it.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President,—

The PRESIDENT: The matter is on the table now and if the Senator wishes to discuss it he must take it from the table.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate H. D. 502, An Act to provide for the registration of resident hunters, tabled by Senator Chick.

On motion by Mr. Chick of Kennebec, the Senate insisted on its former action and joined a committee of conference.

The President appointed on such committee on the part of the Senate, Messrs. Chick, Gillin and Marshall.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate, H. D. 610, Resolve in favor of Fred R. Smith of Pittsfield for expenses incurred as a member of the hospital trustees investigating conditions at the Augusta State hospital in 1913.

On motion by Mr. Holt of Cumberland, tabled.

The PRESIDENT: The President lays before the Senate H. D. 505, An Act to incorporate the Gould Electric Company.

On motion by Mr. Deering of York, tabled and assigned for Thursday morning.

On motion by Mr. Butler of Knox, S. D. 224, majority and minority reports of the committee on judiciary on An Act for the enforcement of liens on watches, clocks and jewelry for labor and materials furnished in making and repairing same.

On further motion by the same senator the majority report, ought to pass, was accepted.

The bill was then given its first reading.

Mr. WOOD of Hancock: Mr. President, I move we take from the table S. D. No. 351, An Act to provide for card index for probate registry of Aroostook county.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOOD: I yield to Senator Burleigh of Aroostook.

Mr. BURLEIGH: Mr. President, this is a bill that I put in for having a record or index made of a lot of old papers that are in the office there at Houlton. One of the attorneys informed me that he spent two days there hunting the records over in order to find some records for a lady that lived in the west part of the State; that he found them at last in an old chest with a lot of papers that never had been indexed, and they were valuable papers. And I put this in so as not to increase the salary but to provide for the indexing, that the county pay for the indexing of those old papers which

are valuable. Some of them never have been recorded. I move that the bill be passed. It is not an increase of any salary, only to provide for having those papers indexed. Mr. Shaw informed me if they had been properly indexed that he could have found them in a very few minutes, while it took him two days to hunt to find the papers that he wanted.

The motion was agreed to and the bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the House for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Lord of York, H. D. No. 622, An Act to amend Section 34 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, relating to free transportation of firemen and policemen by public utilities, was taken from the table.

Mr. LORD: I think that the pending question, Mr. President, is on House Amendment A.

The PRESIDENT: It is.

Mr. LORD: I move to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A. That will be followed by an amendment and in explanation I wish to say this: House Amendment A was intended to combine with H. D. No. 300, which is amending the same section of the Revised Statutes. It appears in the bill as combined that a certain phrase appears in the wrong place, and it is in order to correct an error. So that I wish to move to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A and then present Senate Amendment A in order that the bill may be in correct form.

The motion to indefinitely postpone House Amendment A was agreed to, and on further motion by the same senator Senate Amendment A was adopted and the bill as amended by Senate Amendment A was passed to be engrossed and sent to the House for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Lord of York, H. D. 300, An Act to amend Section 34 of Chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes, relating to public utilities, was taken from the table.

Mr. LORD: Mr. President, as this is the bill which has just been incorporated

by the amendment in H. D. No. 622, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Marshall of Cumberland, H. D. No. 228, An Act repealing laws respecting the government of the fire department of the city of Portland, was taken from the table.

Mr. MARSHALL: I now move that it be indefinitely postponed. In explanation I will say that this bill in substance is covered in another act which will be taken care of by me tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Knox: Mr. President, I move to take from the table—it does not seem to be numbered on the calendar—An Act to fix the salary of the clerk of courts of the county of Lincoln.

The motion was agreed to and the senator yielded to Senator Boynton of Lincoln.

Mr. BOYNTON: Mr. President, this is a bill to increase the salary of the clerk of courts of Lincoln county. He has made a summary of some of the other counties. There are three other counties about the same in population and they have a larger salary. It is summed up to the effect that he is getting from two to four hundred dollars less than either of these other counties for the same work. He has two terms of court a year, and one of these other counties—Franklin, Piscataquis and Sagadahoc—one of them has three terms a year, but they do no more business than he does in two terms; and if he gets this \$200 increase—the salary is \$1000 now and that includes his clerk hire—and if he gets this \$200 increase, then he will be \$200 less than Franklin and \$400 less than Piscataquis, \$800 less than Sagadahoc. The county of Lincoln has a tax rate now of 1.45 mills and they are free from debt, and I move that we substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. GRANT of Cumberland: Mr. President, this is one of the many bills that have come before the committee

on salaries and fees this winter. They have been carefully considered and we have even gone outside of those appearing before us to investigate the various claims that have been made. The committee was unanimous in voting that this ought not to pass. We believe that the man is getting all that he should in comparison with other offices, and I hope that the motion will not prevail to substitute the bill for the report, and I will call for a division.

Mr. BUTLER of Knox: Mr. President, this in one sense is none of my business. I suppose we dip into things more or less of which that would be true from time to time nearly every day. But it is a matter that I feel—and I would not say this to the senate very many times—this is a matter that I feel that I know a great deal about. It is a county that adjoins my own. The present incumbent of the office of clerk of courts held the office at the time when I held the same office in my own county. At that time we had conventions of clerks of courts, calling in all the clerks of the state. We compared notes, and we knew the business of one office as compared with the business of another office. I do feel, while I have great respect for the committee on salaries and fees, I do feel that they have erred in this case, that they should have granted the small increase of \$200 to put this office perhaps on a par with other offices of the same size.

Now the county of Franklin and the county of Piscataquis and the county of Lincoln are practically the same size, and a clerk competent to do the work in one would be competent and efficient in doing the work of another. Now what do we find in our salary list in regard to those three counties? Franklin county \$1200, Lincoln county \$1000, Piscataquis county \$1200. I might mention also Hancock county which has but two terms of supreme court a year, the salary there is \$1800. We all know they get big salaries down in Hancock county. They are good men. But this salary list of clerk of courts of Maine is glaringly full of inequalities, and any fairminded man looking at it must say that

that is true. I believe that the clerk in a small county has personally to do more work than the clerk in Cumberland county. The office of the clerk of courts in Cumberland county could run a month as well as not if the clerk were not there, because he has high salaried assistants to help him in his work. Now in Lincoln county the clerk has no assistant unless he hires one out of his \$1000 a year. How in heaven's name can a man live on it? I have no desire to overturn the reports of committees. I simply appeal to this body of men to be fair to this man. As I said before, it is not my matter. I am trying to assist another senator, trying to assist him not because he wanted me to, but because I believe this matter is right. Now he asked for a modest increase—\$200. And if he is not worth \$1200, he ought not to be filling that job, and if he is worth \$1200 he ought to have it at the hands of this legislature. I second the motion that the bill be substituted for the report of the committee.

Mr. GILLIN of Penobscot. Mr. President, if I was going to get advice for a person who was sick and threatened with appendicitis, I should call on Dr. Fulton or Dr. Gordon. I think when you come round to the question of the salaries of clerks of court, you probably would call on one of the attorneys who are thoroughly familiar with the subject matter from daily contact with it. I am also glad that many of the business men from the different counties are familiar with the duties which devolve upon our clerks of court and the courteous consideration which they extend to them. I simply rise, not to delay by making a speech or attempting to, but believing from what I have heard from Senator Boynton and Senator Butler that the amount asked for in this bill ought to be granted to this clerk of courts, I simply wish to endorse what they have said and ask the Senate to accept the bill in lieu of the report.

Mr. GRANT: I think that lawyers, as the Senator has said, are better qualified to judge on legal matters; but this committee was made up at the

beginning of the session of men like Senator Conant and Senator Hastings and seven good business men from the House. Unfortunately there were no lawyers, as I remember, on this committee. But we have considered the matter carefully.

But back of that, it has been the policy of this state to readjust salaries but once in ten years. Four years ago there was a commission appointed of which the senator from Waldo, Senator Conant was a member, and they went over this state, holding sessions in every county, and they were a committee well qualified to judge where increases should be made, and they granted such increases as in their judgment should be granted at that time.

Now at the beginning of this session we took the matter up with the Governor. He is much opposed to any increases being made at this time on that account. He thinks it is a wrong idea, and the committee generally followed that way. There were a few instances where changes have been made, where we thought it would be an injustice to leave it as it was at the present time, changes that had come about since that commission visited those counties. But where there have been no changes, we have left them as they are in almost every case. In my own county of Cumberland increases were asked aggregating over \$6000, and I believe only \$300 outside of two clerks, stenographers, have been granted, only an increase of \$300.

Mr. BUTLER: May I ask the gentleman a question?

The PRESIDENT: If the senator is willing to be interrupted.

Mr. BUTLER: I beg the senator's pardon for interrupting him. What is the salary of your clerk of courts?

Mr. GRANT: I do not recall what the salary is. Of course they vary in different counties.

Mr. BUTLER: It is over \$2000, isn't it?

Mr. GRANT: I do not remember. But I do not think that enters into

this discussion, whatever. We have only made a very few increases in the state, and I am very sure that if we make much increase that we will not get by. Now there are a number of reports, ought not to pass. The great majority of them are reported that way. There has been some log-rolling, evidently, some lobbying, and a number of these bills are held up. If they can start to turn down the report of the committee I do not know where they will land, but I hope that the committee who have carefully considered these cases will be sustained by this Senate.

Mr. BUTLER: With the gentleman's permission, I would like to ask him a question. Do you believe that \$1,200 is too much salary for this office?

Mr. GRANT: I might answer the question by asking another one. Do you know that this is all the man has for a business or a profession,—that he gets no other income outside of this thousand dollars?

Mr. BUTLER: Mr. President, I do know this, that he is a lawyer.

Mr. GRANT: Will you allow me to ask Senator Boynton that question?

Mr. BOYNTON: Mr. President, I believe, if I understand it right, that he is clerk of the county commissioners. I do not know what the salary is.

Mr. GRANT: That answers the question.

Mr. BOYNTON: I do not know whether it carries any salary or not.

Mr. BUTLER: I do not see how that answers the question at all. I understand, according to the salary list here, that \$1,000 is in full for all services as clerk of the supreme court and county commissioners' court. It used to be the law, and I believe it has always been the law and is the law today, that there is no additional compensation but only additional burdens. Now I may be wrong, but that is what I believe the law to be.

Mr. GRANT: I understand he gets other income.

Mr. BUTLER: I hope he does.

Mr. GRANT: As we have found in many other cases on investigation of those outside of those appeared before our committee, there has been only one side presented. The tax-payers whom we represent and protect have not been before our committee at all. Only the man holding office appearing before our committee it would be a one-sided argument every time. But I believe it is our duty to protect the tax-payer.

Mr. DEERING: Mr. President, I rise to say simply, that as I understand the office of clerk of courts, it means clerk of all the courts in the county, and the court of the county commissioners is included in that, and the salary that is laid down in the Revised Statutes is the salary that he receives for all of those positions.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would like to know what other counties in the State pay their clerk of courts a salary of \$1,000 and what pay \$1,200. Has the Senator from Knox a list before him of the various county clerks and would he kindly read it?

Mr. BUTLER: I have, Mr. President. If I might answer the gentleman, I would say that there is no county, as I remember it, that pays \$1,000 as salary save Lincoln. I will give you the list in a moment. With the indulgence of the Senate Mr. President, I would like to read the salaries of several—it will take but a moment.

Androscoggin \$2,000, Aroostook \$2,000, Cumberland \$2,500, deputy clerk, Cumberland \$1,700, Franklin \$1,200, Hancock \$1,800, Kennebec \$2,350, Knox \$1,300, Lincoln \$1,000, Oxford \$1,600, Penobscot \$2,200, Piscataquis \$1,200, Sagadahoc \$1,700, Somerset \$1,800, Waldo \$1,200, Washington \$1,450, York \$1,900.

The pending question being on the motion of the senator from Lincoln, Senator Boynton, that the bill be substituted for the report, a viva voce vote was taken, and the motion was adopted, and so the bill was substituted for the report.

Tabled for printing under joint rules.

On motion by Mr. Marshall of Cumberland it was

Ordered, that 500 additional copies of Senate Document 375 be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. AMES of Washington: Mr. President, I move that we reconsider the vote whereby we finally passed a resolve appropriating money for the repair of Teacher's Old Home on Old Town Indian Island No. 1.

The motion was agreed to and on further motion by the same senator the resolve was tabled.

Mr. WALKER of Somerset: Mr. President, I move we take from the table the resolve in favor of the several academies, institutes, seminaries and colleges for maintenance and for repairs and improvements.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Walker then offered Senate Amendment C.

"Senate Amendment C to House Document No. 613, relating to appropriation for academies.

"Amend by substituting the amount of one thousand dollars in place of five hundred dollars for Freedom Academy for the year 1917, and by substituting the amount of one thousand dollars in place of five hundred dollars for Freedom Academy for the year 1918, so that said resolve shall read as follows:

"For the year nineteen hundred seventeen. Freedom Academy, Freedom:

"For meeting deficiency and current expenses, and for making urgent repairs, one thousand dollars. (\$1000.)

"For the year nineteen hundred eighteen. Freedom Academy, Freedom:

"For meeting deficiency and current expenses, and for making urgent repairs, one thousand dollars. (\$1000.)

"Amend further by substituting the amount of fifteen hundred dollars in place of one thousand dollars for Saint Joseph's Academy for the year 1917 and by substituting the amount of fifteen hundred dollars in place of one thousand dollars for Saint Joseph's Academy for the year 1918, so that said resolve shall read as follows:

"For the year nineteen hundred seventeen. Saint Joseph's Academy, Portland:

"For maintenance, fifteen hundred dollars. (\$1500.)

"For the year nineteen hundred eighteen. Saint Joseph's Academy Portland:

"For maintenance, fifteen hundred dollars. (\$1500.)"

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I move we adopt Senate Amendment C to House Document 613.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICKER of Hancock: Mr. President, I offer Senate Amendment D to House Document 613.

"Amendment D to Senate Document 613.

Senate Document 613, entitled, Resolve in favor of several academies, institutes, seminaries and colleges for maintenance and for repairs and improvement," is hereby amended by adding to the resolve after the words "for the years 1917 and 1918," the words "Eastern Maine Institute, Springfield, for payment of instructors \$500."

Mr. RICKER: Mr. President, I move the adoption of Senate Amendment D.

The motion was agreed to and the resolve as amended by Senate Amendments A, B, C and D was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Walker of Somerset, H. D. 128, An Act to amend Section 49 of Chapter 9 of the Revised Statutes, exempting Maine casualty assessment insurance companies from the payment of tax on premiums was taken from the table.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, I now yield to the senator from Somerset, Senator Merrill.

Mr. MERRILL of Somerset: Mr. President, I move that the bill be passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Mr. DEERING of York: Mr. President, I desire to ask for some information. I notice that this bill exempts from the ordinary taxation of insurance companies, casualty insurance companies. I think there must be someone in the Senate who can explain why these particular companies should be excepted, and I desire to hear from them at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT of Kennebec: Mr. President, as a member of the committee on mercantile affairs and insurance I will say in explanation that all the

mutual insurance companies, local companies, as far as I know all the local mutual insurance companies of Maine, are now exempt from taxation except these casualty companies, and that was the argument put up to the committee that this should be reported and put them on the same basis as all the other local companies doing business in insurance.

On motion by Mr. Deering the bill was tabled.

On motion by Mr. Conant of Waldo, S. D. 378, An Act to amend Chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes relating to State and State aid highways, and to provide a mill tax fund for their construction, was taken from the table.

Mr. CONANT: Mr. President, I now move that the bill be recommitted to the committee on ways and bridges, and in explanation I will say that some changes must be made in the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Stanley of Oxford, the vote was reconsidered whereby the Senate passed to be enacted, An Act to amend Section 19 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes relating to the banking department.

On further motion by the same senator the bill was tabled.

Mr. DAVIES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I rise to a point of inquiry, if I may. I would like to inquire whether the resolve, H. D. 613, carried an appropriation for the North Yarmouth Academy.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps the senator from Somerset can inform you.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, it surely did.

Mr. DAVIES: Mr. President, and

may I ask the amount of Senator Walker, through the President, if he remembers.

Mr. WALKER: Mr. President, as I remember it was \$750. It was the amount asked for. No, it was \$500 for each year.

The PRESIDENT: "For repair and improvement of buildings and improvement of grounds \$500."

Mr. DAVIES: And \$500 for 1918?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, for 1917 and 1918.

Mr. WOOD of Hancock: Mr. President, I move that we reconsider the vote whereby we passed to be enacted An Act to amend Section 11 of Chapter 117 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the salaries of the stenographers of the superior courts.

The motion was agreed to, and on further motion by the same senator the bill was tabled.

On motion by Mr. Gordon of York, S. D. 348, An Act to amend Section 28 of Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, relating to violations of the lobster law, was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same senator the bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Lord of York, H. D. 548, An Act to amend Paragraph 1, of Section 4 of Chapter 72 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the appointment of guardians, was taken from the table.

On further motion by the same senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed.

On motion by Mr. Boynton of Lincoln,

Adjourned.