

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-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1913

HOUSE.

Wednesday, March 5, 1913.

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Clark of Gardiner.

Journal of previous session read and approved.

Papers from the Senate disposed of in concurrence.

From the Senate: An Act to incorporate the Sandy Stream Log Driving Company.

This bill came from the Senate in that branch recommitted to the committee on interior waters.

On motion by Mr. Marston of Skowhegan, the House voted to concur with the Senate in its recommitment of the bill to the committee on interior waters.

Senate Bills on First Reading.

An Act to amend chapter six of the Revised Statutes, relating to regulation and conduct of elections. (The report of the committee on judiciary was accepted in concurrence, and on motion by Mr. Smith of Presque Isle the bill was tabled pending its first reading and specially assigned for consideration on Tuesday of next week.)

An Act to extend the charter of the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Saco.

An Act to incorporate the Kingfield Chamber of Commerce.

An Act to amend section 63 of chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by chapter 73 of the Public Laws of 1909 and as further amended by chapters 62 and 116 of the Public Laws of 1909 relating to payment of tuition in secondary schools.

An Act to incorporate the State of Maine Fire Insurance Company.

Resolve in favor of the Farmington State Normal School for furnishings and equipment for a dormitory.

The following bills, petitions, etc., were presented and referred:

Judiciary.

By Mr. Bragdon of York: Remonstrance of Frank D. Weeks and 24

others remonstrating against the passage of House Bill No. 131, relating to Ogunquit Village Corporation; also remonstrance of W. J. Storer and 11 others against same; also remonstrance of Edmund Garland and nine others against same; also remonstrance of Roy S. Moulton and seven others against same; also remonstrance of Walter D. Davis and 26 others against same; also remonstrance of Freeman E. Rankin and 22 others against same; also remonstrance of Clarence A. Hilton and 29 others against same.

Legal Affairs.

By Mr. Rousseau of Brunswick: An Act relative to probate bonds.

By Mr. Gallagher of Bangor: An Act regulating the licensing of minors, by school committees, to engage in certain occupations in cities.

Education.

By Mr. Jones of China: Remonstrance of P. W. Dodge and 21 others of China against any change of method of apportionment of State common school funds as recommended by a legislative committee to inquire into the same; also remonstrance of W. W. Washburn and 19 others of China against same; also remonstrance of Irving W. Reed and seven others of China against same; also remonstrance of C. N. Webber and 13 others of China against same; also remonstrance of O. F. Sproul and 20 others of China against same.

Ways and Bridges.

By Mr. Jones of China: Remonstrance of F. A. Doe and 40 others of China against the passage of bill requiring certain vehicles to carry lights at night on public highways.

Inland Fisheries and Game.

By Mr. Harriman of Cherryfield: Petition of Percy Wakefield and seven others of Cherryfield, and F. J. Longfellow and 19 others of Beddington asking that a law be enacted prohibiting the digging out of fox dens and capturing their young.

Sea and Shore Fisheries.

By Mr. Trimble of Calais: Remonstrance of F. H. Carlow and 39 others of Calais against proposed change

in sardine laws; also remonstrance of George R. Gardiner and 63 others of Calais against same; also remonstrance of V. M. Wentworth and 12 others of Calais against same; also remonstrance of William E. Mann and 80 others of Calais against same.

By Mr. Washburn of Perry: Petition of Howard W. Allen and 72 others of Robbinston and Perry asking for passage of bill entitled "An Act for the better protection of herring and herring fisheries in the waters of St. Croix River and Passamaquoddy Bay, in the County of Washington; also petition of James Ross and 65 others for same.

By same gentleman: Remonstrance of T. Robinson and 11 others against any change in the present close time on packing of sardines; also remonstrance of E. E. Hobart and 28 others against same; also remonstrance of C. A. Pottle and five others against same; also remonstrance of C. N. Ferguson and 23 others against same; also remonstrance of E. C. Brown and 27 others against same; also remonstrance of L. E. Holmes and 33 others against same; also remonstrance of S. E. Cox and 39 others against same.

Taxation.

By Mr. Sargent of Portland: An Act to amend sub-section two of section six of chapter nine of the Revised Statutes, relating to exemption of property from taxation. (Tabled for printing pending reference to the committee on motion by Mr. Sargent.)

By same gentleman: An Act to raise revenue for the support of the State government by the levy and collection of a tax on incomes. (Tabled for printing pending reference to the committee on motion by Mr. Sargent.)

Reports of Committees.

Mr. Wheeler from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to amend section one of chapter 313 of the Private and Special Laws of 1864 entitled "An Act to incorporate the Baskahegan Dam Company," as amended by chapter 272 of the Private and Special Laws of 1903, and by chapter 147 of the Private and Special Laws of 1911.

Mr. Irving from the committee on taxation, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" bill, An Act to amend section two of chapter 74 of the Public Laws of 1909, relative to assessment of taxes for street sprinkling.

Mr. Ricker from the committee on education, reported in a new draft and "ought to pass" resolve in favor of Washington State Normal School at Machias for equipment, repairs and permanent improvements.

Mr. Connors from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act relating to the Jervis Manufacturing Company.

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

Mr. Peacock from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Kennebec County Agricultural Society. (Tabled pending acceptance of the report of the committee on motion by Mr. Peacock.)

Mr. Connors from the committee on legal affairs, reported "ought to pass" on bill, An Act to incorporate the Kennebec Realty Company.

The report was accepted, and this bill having been already printed received its first and second readings and was assigned for to-morrow morning for its third reading.

First Reading of Printed Bills and Resolves.

An Act relating to the inspection of lime casks.

An Act to amend chapter 613 of the Private and Special Laws of 1893 entitled "An Act to establish the Western Hancock Municipal Court."

An Act to incorporate the Pleasant Hill Cemetery Association in the town of Webster.

An Act to amend chapter 30 of the Private and Special Laws of 1911, authorizing the Wiscasset, Waterville & Farmington Railway Company to dispose of part of the property of said Company.

An Act to authorize the city council of the city of Belfast to grant permission to Matthews Brothers to construct and maintain a suspension

bridge over and across Front street in said Belfast.

An Act providing a punishment for certain indecent and immoral offences.

An Act to amend section 13 of chapter four of the Revised Statutes, as amended by chapter 200 of the Public Laws of 1909.

An Act to amend section 38 of chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes, relative to giving notice of the time and place of sale of shares of stock in corporations to pay assessments.

An Act to amend the charter of the Camden-Rockland Water Company. (Tabled pending its second reading on motion by Mr. Elliott of Thomaston.)

An Act to incorporate the Madison Water District.

An Act to organize the Ashland Water Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lincoln Light & Power Company.

An Act to amend chapter 154 of the Private and Special Laws of 1895, as amended by chapter 156 of the Private and Special Laws of 1911, relating to the charter of the Wiscasset Water Company.

An Act to authorize Frank W. Hunt & Company to erect and maintain a bridge across the Mattawamkeag river.

An Act to repeal chapter 503 of the Private and Special Laws of 1828, as amended by chapter 508 of the Private and Special Laws of 1874, and by chapter 254 of the Private and Special Laws of 1876, relating to the taking of fish in Narraguagus river.

An Act to permit the shipment once in ten days under special license tag of 10 pounds of fish caught in Moosehead lake.

An Act to regulate fishing in Rangeley, Cupsuptic and Mooselucmeguntic Lakes. (Tabled pending its second reading and specially assigned for tomorrow morning on motion by Mr. Austin of Phillips.)

An Act for the better protection of shell fish within the town of Kennebunkport in the county of York.

An Act to incorporate Connor Plantation.

An Act to disorganize Plantation No. 8 in the county of Hancock.

Resolve in aid of navigation on Rangeley, Mooselucmeguntic and Cupsuptic Lakes.

Resolve in favor of a highway bridge in the Plantation of New Canada.

Resolve in favor of highway in the town of Ripley.

Resolve in favor of aid in building bridge across Moose river near its mouth.

Resolve in favor of main highway leading from the town of Franklin, Hancock county, to the town of Cherryfield in Washington county.

Resolve in favor of aid in building bridge across Passadumkeag Stream, Grand Falls Plantation.

Resolve in favor of aid in repairing highway in the town of Cutler.

Resolve in aid of building bridge across Sandy Stream in the Plantation of Lexington.

Resolve in favor of bridge across Umculcus Stream in Oxbow Plantation, Aroostook county.

Resolve in favor of John R. Dinsmore of Kittery.

Resolve in favor of James R. Henton of Milford.

Passed to Be Engrossed.

An Act to amend Section 17 of Chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the administering of the oaths required by the courts of probate.

An Act to incorporate the Capitol Island Village Corporation.

An Act to extend the charter of the Matagamon Towboat Company.

An Act to repeal Section 1 of Chapter 158, of the Public Laws of 1911, relating to annual examinations of Savings Banks and Trust Companies.

An Act to punish the making or use of false statements to obtain property or credit. (Tabled pending its third reading on motion by Mr. Plummer of Lisbon.)

An Act to extend and amend the charter of Eastern Maine Railroad.

An Act to repeal Chapter 199 of the Public Laws of 1911, entitled "An Act to provide for the nomination of party primary."

An Act authorizing the Atlantic Shore Railway to increase its capital stock. (Tabled pending its third reading on motion by Mr. Mitchell of Kittery.)

An Act to amend Chapter 504 of the Private and Special Laws of 1889, incorporating the Otter Creek Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the act which constitutes the police court for the City of Rockland.

An Act to amend the charter of the Rumford Falls Light & Water Co.

An Act to incorporate the Harvey Memorial Crittenton Home.

Resolve relating to the publication of "The Beginnings of Colonial Maine."

Resolve in favor of Charles Fogg of Norway.

Resolve in favor of Betsy A. Dyer for State pension.

Passed to Be Enacted.

An Act to revive and extend the powers of the Litchfield Electrical Company.

An Act to incorporate the Mount Vernon Water & Electric Company.

An Act to authorize the Kingman Lumber Company to build and maintain piers and booms in Mattawamkeag and Molunkus Rivers.

An Act to repeal the laws providing for a bounty on bears.

An Act to repeal Chapter 337 of the Private and Special Laws of 1825 entitled "An Act for the preservation of fish in Piscataqua river.

An Act to change the name of Hayden Lake, so-called, to Wesserrunsett Lake.

Finally Passed.

Resolve in aid of repairing highway in the town of Benton.

Resolve providing a State pension for Callie Maines.

Resolve providing a State pension for James Lombard.

Resolve providing a State pension for Vinnie E. Saunders.

Resolve providing a State pension for Samuel J. Tarr.

Resolve providing a State pension for Henrietta S. Hodgdon.

Resolve for the permanent improvement and repair of the New Kenduskeag Road in the town of Glenburn.

Resolve for aid in building road in the town of Rockport.

Resolve in favor of the town of Whitneyville for extra expense in repairing of bridge.

Resolve for aid in building road in New Canada Plantation.

Resolve in aid of navigation on Sebec Lake.

Resolve for aid in repairing Rockland-Rockport Trunk Line.

Resolve in aid of the educational work of Greeley Institute.

Resolve for money expended by the town of Carthage for maintenance of a free High school.

Resolve to reimburse the town of Nobleboro for money expended for benefit of an insane pauper.

Resolve for the general maintenance and support of the University of Maine.

Resolve in aid of navigation on the Lower Lakes.

Resolve in aid of repairing highway in the town of Trescott.

Resolve in favor of a road in Ellitsville plantation.

Resolve in favor of raising and repairing the bridge over Garland's Brook in the town of Mariaville.

Resolve providing a State pension for Rosa Prentiss.

Resolve providing for additional equipment for and a method of lighting the dormitory of the Eastern State Normal School.

Resolve providing a State pension for Helen B. Hobart.

Resolve providing for a State pension for Bridget Kelly.

Resolve for reimbursement to the town of Talmadge for certain money expended for an insane pauper.

Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution conferring the right of suffrage on women.

The SPEAKER: This resolve in on its final passage, and requires a vote of two-thirds of the members, providing a quorum is present.

Mr. NEWBERT of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I have said in this House all that I intend to say upon this resolve, and I rise now simply to re-affirm the position which I took in this House, last Wednesday, and ask this House to look soberly upon this resolve. It

is on its final passage, and you will have no other opportunity to express your conviction. I am willing at any time in this House to support a resolve referring this great question to the women of our State; and when a majority of the women of our State have expressed a desire for suffrage I will not give my support and my vote to the passage of a resolve submitting the question to the legal voters of this State. I speak again, gentlemen, for 200,000 women of Maine, who are not asking for suffrage and who have not been here, who are not now here and who will not come here. To my mind this question is too momentous in its consequences to the women of our State for me or for you to play politics with. I am naturally suspicious when I find on the floor of this House men of the two great parties who are willing to stultify a conviction. I am naturally suspicious in my mind when I see politicians of the two great parties trimming their sails to catch the new passing breeze, willing to exploit the women of our State instead of having them lifted up, creating a situation where they will come down to our level.

Gentlemen, if I vote alone I shall vote against the passage of this resolve, today, and I am willing to go before the people of this State at any time seeking any political preferment upon the stand I have taken here.

Mr. SWIFT of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, it has been stated here that the woman agitator for equal suffrage is the exception. That does not alter the fact that women believe they should have the ballot and would exercise it if granted.

We have no reason to think, even if women were obliged to mingle and associate with men in voting, that they would become less womanly.

Did Florence Nightingale become coarse or degraded while ministering to wounded soldiers in Crimea?

Did Clara Barton, in the midst of sick and dying soldiers of the Civil War, or in any of her work in this country or in Europe become any less a pure and noble woman?

Joan of Arc, we all know was re-

vered and loved by the French people and soldiers. Queen Victoria was ever considered the most devoted wife and mother, notwithstanding the fact that in her long reign over the English people she was constantly associated with men.

Charles H. Stearns of Pasadena, Cal., says: "I have come to look for great ultimate good from woman suffrage, but I believe it will not be as immediate as many seem to think. The benefit will be reactive. Woman will retain all her womanly charms and will take a broader view of life and its relations. She will be a better citizen, because a more thoughtful intelligent individual. She will at least be as conscientious in securing for herself an intelligent comprehension of the civic problems, as is the average man, and will be a better, because more intelligent, mother and companion. She cannot but be in a better position, because of her enlarged interest, to train and direct her children, and who can doubt the great ultimate advantage to the race?"

Here in Pasadena we have had two elections to decide certain municipal problems and also a Presidential primary, and I know of many women who were opposed to the extension of suffrage, who have not failed to vote at each opportunity."

Now, gentlemen, this is not sentiment, this is not theory, this is a plain statement of facts made by a practical man closely observing the practical workings of the law in a city where women have the ballot and use it.

The people are demanding the right and the demand is legitimate to vote upon this question, and we cannot consistently as legislators stand here and refuse them this privilege, knowing this demand to be State wide.

We, as members of this house, have the power but no moral right to say to the people of Maine: You are not to be trusted. You shall not vote upon this question.

Mr. Speaker: I shall vote to submit the question of equal suffrage for women, to the people, and as Gov Hoch said in his lecture, last evening,

"You may as well get ready for it. It's coming." (Applause.)

Mr. WHEELER of South Paris: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I do not have any intention of occupying the time of the House, this morning, in continuing the line of discussion which we participated in a few days ago. I believe we all appreciate the advantages of Legislative procedure in this instance which has allowed the house to hear and pass upon arguments in favor of woman's suffrage upon the merits of the question itself. Now, we come, this morning, to the parliamentary stage which is not concerned particularly with the question of woman's suffrage as we would vote upon it at the polls. We are concerned solely, this morning, with the question of whether it is advisable to submit this matter to the people for their decision. The remarks which are proper to be said upon the measure by the friends of the measure have already been made, and it is my intention now to solely second the force of their remarks made by the gentleman from Augusta, who sits on this side of the House (Mr. Swift), as opposed to the gentleman from Augusta, who sits on the other side of the House (Mr. Newbert). Inasmuch as the third candidate for the mayor of Augusta is not entitled to speak upon the floor of the House possibly I may be speaking for him. I wish it to be understood that the friends of the measure do not desire to participate in a discussion of a matter which will probably go to the voter; but at this time the friends of the measure do insist that the members of the House ought to vote upon this question merely upon the question of the referendum. This is the day of the referendum. They are interested in this question and they are entitled to express their opinion upon its passage. I hope the measure will have the requisite number of votes to secure its final passage.

Mr. DUNTON of Belfast: When the first vote was taken on this resolve I voted in its favor. I did not hear any sufficient argument presented against this resolve to convince me that I

ought to vote against it, and I fear that the main question has not been properly considered by us upon whom lies the duty to decide it. The plain and simple question is whether we men of the Maine Legislature shall permit the men who sent us here to act for them to express their wishes in relation to this question in the way that the Constitution of this State provides. We are not here, gentlemen, to settle questions of this sort. It is beyond our province to say whether the women of this State shall vote, or whether they shall not. The men who sent us here should retain in their own hands the power to change the Constitution that governs all the doings of this Legislature. The sovereign power that once rested in a King now resides in the sovereign people of this State, and that Constitution which is our guide provides that whenever a desire is expressed to change that Constitution the people themselves shall vote upon it. The question that has been agitated here largely is this: Ought the men of Maine to grant the right of suffrage to women, when the real question is: Ought this Legislature to permit the men of Maine to grant, if they see fit, the right to vote to the women of Maine. Is there any probability, gentlemen, that the men of this State would grant the right of suffrage to women? If not, why shall we fear to submit the question to them? And, gentlemen, if there is any probability that the men of Maine will so vote what right have we to deny them the right to so grant it? Shall we deny these men who are the sovereign people of this State, and who sent us here, that right which they reserved to themselves when they made this Constitution? Is it necessary for a majority of the voters of this State to come here and be counted in favor of a given question on the merits of that question before we are justified in submitting it to the people? Gentlemen, how are we to judge whether a question of changing the Constitution should be submitted to the people? By petitions from the people? Petitions have been poured into this Legislature since the first

day that resolve was deposited in the Legislature asking that the people be permitted to vote upon it. This question is not a new question. It has been agitated year after year; not only in this State; but in nearly every state in the Union. Ten states, as I understand it, have already granted the right of suffrage to women; and this very winter, Nevada, Montana, South Dakota, New York and New Jersey—five more states—have voted to let the people decide that question, which is their question and not ours. What are we called upon today to do, gentlemen? Not to decide that plain question on its merits; but to decide whether the people of Maine shall be permitted to decide it upon its merits. Do we fear the decision? Who made us guardians of the people who sent us here? We are guardians of the Constitution; but not of the men who made, and have the power and the right to unmake, the Constitution in whole or in part; and I say that the vote we have taken on this question, if we put it upon the merits of it, is nothing more, and should be regarded as nothing more than a straw vote showing how each man felt at that time on the main question, and how he would vote if that main question of giving votes to women was submitted to him as a voter at the polls. Our duty goes further than that, gentlemen. We are not here simply to represent our individual opinion on a question of this kind. The people of this State have sent us here to exercise our judgment on most of the matters that come before us; but on this question they have sent us here to obey the manifest wish of the people of this State that that question be submitted to them; and gentlemen of my political faith have always held to that principle; that has been a principle of that party for more than one hundred years, that the people were the sovereigns, and that the people should rule, and that the officers of the people should trust the people.

I see two years from now, and I hear the arguments that will be made against us, and the charges of incon-

sistency. How many years, gentlemen, they will say, has this party of the people demanded that another question be submitted to the people, and in the question have denied to the people the rights which from that time immemorial they have demanded for the people?

Gentlemen, this is not a party question. No party, so far as I know, has caucused upon it or endeavored to bind its members to one side or the other of that question; but as individual, honest men, who are here to represent the people, I claim that we should consider very carefully this side of the question which has not, I believed, received our mature consideration. It reduces itself, gentlemen, to that question—as to whether we shall trust the people to decide the question which the Constitution expressly provides it is their province to settle. A majority of this Legislature, gentlemen—a large majority of this Legislature—voting upon the main question, I believe, have expressed by their votes that they, if permitted to vote, would vote in favor of suffrage. I believe that can be taken as an indication, assuming that they have voted upon that main question upon its merits, of how the men at home would vote upon the merits of this question if they were permitted to vote. In answer to one objection to this I wish to say that in the homes of Maine there are women, and in these same homes there are men, and if the men decide this question at the polls they will do so in the light of the conviction of the women in their homes; and when we submit this question to the vote of the men of Maine we are at that same time submitting it to the vote of the women, and shall have their opinion and the same expression in the votes of the men that we would have if it were submitted to the votes of the women themselves. Do they desire to vote? That is not the question. It is not a question that the men honor the old-fashioned women of Maine. It is not a question as to whether the advocates of this measure go about with long hair and dressed in kimonos, or whether

they go about with scant locks on their heads. It is not a question of ridicule; it is not a question of the age of chivalry; but it is a question of the age of commonsense of this year, 1913, and not the question that was discussed in the beginning. Time has changed. This is not a political age; but an industrial age; and the freedom that the people of this country are clamoring for, and need, is not political freedom, but industrial freedom. I say to you gentlemen, that with all these changes of conditions has come a change in the sentiment of the men and women of this country in relation to this question. Is the President of the United States in favor of it? His state has voted to submit to the people. I know not; but I know that there are many antiquated opinions passed around against this measure; but I say that it should be decided not as a question of 50 years ago, 10 years ago, or two years ago; but as a question of today; and that resolves itself to this: Shall we permit the people of the State of Maine to express their will at the ballot box on this question? (Applause)

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

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of demanding the yeas and nays will rise and stand in their places.

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

Mr. SARGENT of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word. I would like to give my reasons why I voted as I did the other day. My mother was an old-fashioned woman, whom they talked about so much here the other day. She knew 10 times as much about the politics of this country as my father did, about the system of government, about the speeches in Congress and in our Legislature and everywhere else. Now, I don't believe in submitting this question to the women because there is a large portion of them who say they do not want to vote, and they would be poor persons to refer it to. I think the men are the best ones to decide this, when we come to an election. Well do I remember 60

years ago when my mother told me about all kinds of government. At that time the United States was about the only Republican form of government we had in the world. At that time my mother told me about Kings ruling over the people, and I remember very well asking her how it was that Kings should rule over the whole people, and she told me that they fooled them and told them that they couldn't govern themselves. (Applause)

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is on the final passage of this resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution of Maine conferring the right of suffrage on women. Those in favor of the final passage of this resolve, when their names are called, will answer yes, those opposed will answer no. The clerk will call the roll.

YEA:—Allen, Austin, Bass, Benn, Benton, Bither, Boman, Bowler, Bragdon of Sullivan, Bragdon of York, Bucklin, Butler, Chick, Churchill, Cochran, Cook, Descoteaux, Duntun, Durgin, Emerson, Estes, Farnham, Farrar, Folsom, Franck, Gordon, Greenleaf of Auburn, Greenleaf of Otisfield, Haines, Harman, Harper, Higgins, Hodsdon, Hutchins, Irving, Johnson, Jones, Kimball, Leary, Leveille, Marston, Mathieson, McBride, McFadden, Metcalf, Mitchell of Kittery, Mitchell of Newport, Mooers, Morrison, Nute, O'Connell, Peacock, Pendleton, Peters, Peterson, Pitcher, Plummer, Richardson, Ricker, Roberts, Rousseau, Sanborn, Sargent, Skelton, Skillin, Smith of Auburn, Smith of Patten, Smith of Pittsfield, Smith of Presque Isle, Spencer, Stanley, Stevens, Stuart, Sturgis, Swift, Taylor, Thombs, Thompson, Tobey, Trimble, Tryon, Twombly, Umphrey, Violette, Washburn, Waterhouse, Wheeler, Winchenbaugh, Wise—89.

NAY:—Boland, Brennan, Brown, Chadbourne, Clark of Portland, Clark of New Portland, Connors, Crowell, Currier, Cyr, Davis, Doherty, Donovan, Dresser, Dunbar, Eaton, Eldridge, Elliott, Gallagher, Gamache, Gardner, Goodwin, Hancock, Harriman, Haskell, Hogan, Jennings, Kehoe, Kelleher of Portland, Kelleher of Waterville, Lawry, LeBel, Libby, Mason, Maxwell, Merrill, Mildon, Morgan, Morse, Newbert, Packard, Price, Putnam, Quinn, Robinson, Rolfe, Sherman, Snow, Sprague, Stetson, Swett, Yeaton—53.

ABSENT:—Eastman, Jenkins, Leader, Maybury, Morneau, Peaks, Ramsay, Sanderson, Scates—9.

The SPEAKER: Eighty-nine having voted in the affirmative and 53 in the negative, the resolve fails of a final passage.

Orders of the Day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will take up in order matters that come off of the table at this time according to the order which was passed by the House. The first matter in order passed by the House. The first matter in order for consideration under that order passed by the House is House Document No. 353, bill, an Act relating to the charter of the city of Bangor.

On motion by Mr. Gallagher of Bangor the bill was referred to the committee on legal affairs.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to provide for instruction in road building in the public schools.

On motion by Mr. Mitchell of Newport this bill was referred to the committee on education.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to amend Chapter 489 of the Private and Special Laws of 1901 entitled "An Act to supply the town of Lubec with pure water."

Mr. McFadden of Lubec moved that the matter be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER: The pending question on this bill is concurrent action with the Senate in referring the bill to the next Legislature.

Mr. AUSTIN of Phillips: Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the information of the House that I have absolutely no interest in this matter at all, personally or otherwise, but it seems to me that at this stage of the session it would be wise to clear our calendar as far as possible. I understand there is no possible way towards getting the consent of the Senate in entertaining matters of private and special legislation; and if that is the case, and if I am correctly informed that the Senate refuses to entertain these matters of private and special legislation which have come in since the time expired for the receipt of such matters, it would seem to be wise and expedient to get them off from the calendar. I do not want the gentleman from Lubec (Mr. Mc-

Fadden) to think however that I have any enmity to this proposed legislation, and if he prefers to have it laid upon the table for further consideration I have nothing to say.

Mr. MCFADDEN of Lubec: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of considerable importance to the people of Lubec, and I thought that there might be some possible way later on if the matter could be laid on the table where there might be some agreement reached in order that it might be acted upon. That was my only object in having it laid upon the table, and if the House will grant that permission, I would like to have it so remain.

The question being upon the motion to lay the bill upon the table,

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, An Act to permit the town of Pittsfield to obtain a pure water supply.

Mr. Smith of Pittsfield moved that the bill be laid upon the table and specially assigned for consideration, on Wednesday of next week.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to incorporate the Pittsfield Water District. The pending question on this matter is concurrent action with the Senate in referring the bill to the next Legislature.

Mr. Smith of Pittsfield moved that the bill be laid upon the table and specially assigned for consideration, on Wednesday on next week.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act authorizing the city of Bangor to supply the town of Hampden with water. The pending question in connection with this bill is concurrent action with the Senate in referring the bill to the next Legislature.

Mr. GALLAGHER of Bangor: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have that bill lay upon the table for a day or two because I think I can arrange in the course of the next day or two so

that it can be disposed of, and for that reason I move that it be re-tabled. I want it to be kept before the committee on legal affairs in connection with the bill relating to a new charter for the city of Bangor.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was re-tabled.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to enlarge the powers and jurisdiction of the Western Somerset municipal court. The pending question is the third reading of the bill.

On motion by Mr. Dunbar of Jonesport, the bill was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to incorporate the trustees of the John B. Curtis Free Public Library in Bradford. The pending question is concurrent action with the Senate in referring the bill to the next Legislature.

On motion by Mr. Morrison of Corinth the bill was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, An Act to establish a uniform poll tax. The pending question is the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Irving of Caribou moved that the bill be given its third reading.

Mr. Plummer of Lisbon offered House Amendment A, by adding after the word "be" in the fifth line of Section one the words "not more than;" also in Section two, line five, after the word "to" the words "not more than."

Mr. PLUMMER: Mr. Speaker, my object in offering this amendment is to make the matter of poll tax uniform in each town. It is discretionary now with the town to have any limit within one dollar and three dollars. I do not believe in a poll tax. I do not think it a just tax. We talk about double taxation of mortgages, but the poll tax is as much double taxation as is a tax on mortgages. But regardless of that question, we have heard some discussion here, this morning, in regard to local option. I don't know whether the gentlemen believe only in local option

on the rum question, or whether they believe in local option as a general proposition.

The poll tax is a tax that is collected purely for local purposes. The United States government collects its tax largely from customs and internal revenue in the way that it sees fit; the State of Maine collects its revenue also from such sources as it sees fit. I see no reason why each town also should and from such sources as seem good to it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the inhabitants of any town are just as competent to decide whether they want poll taxes, and how much that poll tax should be, as this Legislature is. As has been suggested, this morning, we are not here as guardians of the people; we are here merely with delegated authority to act in matters concerning which they cannot very well act for themselves. For that reason Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion to amend will prevail.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, I believe the position taken by the gentleman from Lisbon (Mr. Plummer) is correct. I have had some experience in town affairs, and I have always believed that each town should have unlimited power to govern its own affairs, and I do not see any reason why this bill should be adopted. Why should not towns be allowed to apportion their taxes as they see fit? Some towns wish to have a small poll tax and other towns wish to have a large poll tax. Permit me to say that our town has a poll tax of three dollars, and it seems to be only just and right; but why should not a town, if they so desire, have their poll tax two dollars or one dollar if they wish. I think that each town is absolutely able to decide that question for themselves, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. NEWBERT of Augusta: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we should not have a uniform poll tax. The city of Augusta had a poll tax of four dollars, and cut it down to three dollars and then cut again to two dollars. It is my opinion that this city has no desire to raise its poll tax; certainly it is satisfied with the two dollar poll tax. It seems to me that there cer-

tainly should be local option in the matter of assessing of poll tax. If the city of Portland is satisfied with two dollars, the city of Augusta with two dollars, and other towns with three, and some with four, I should leave it to the citizens of those towns to decide. As a citizen of Augusta, representing Augusta here, I simply object to a uniform three dollar poll tax because I think the city of Augusta is perfectly satisfied to assess two dollars.

Mr. IRVING of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, I wish to place before the House the finding of the committee, and why they voted to recommend the passage of this bill. There appeared before the committee several witnesses, who testified in regard to this difficulty, that where adjoining towns had different poll taxes there was considerable inconvenience, the transient people or working men would make their residence temporarily in the place where the small poll tax was paid, and frequently the collectors were presented with a receipt for a poll tax paid in an adjoining town, a poll tax of one dollar or possibly two dollars, in lieu of that three dollars that the collector would present a bill for to the party who was scheduled as a citizen of that town.

The average poll tax paid in the State, as I recall it, was a trifle under \$2.70. It was also indirectly recommended by the department that it would be much more convenient and much easier and equally as uniform for all the citizens of the State, to make the poll tax uniform. It is true that there were those who appeared before the committee and advocated a poll tax of one dollar. We approach the matter—and it is a matter for the House to decide—your committee decided that it would be well to recommend the passage of this bill which provides that all citizens shall pay a poll tax of three dollars wherever they may reside. The present law provides that he may pay a poll tax of not greater than three nor less than one dollar. The amendment which is offered makes the same provision as to the three dollars, but it also provides, as I understand it, that there shall be

no lower limit, but that the town may vote to assess no poll tax.

It is not a question as to whether it shall be one or two or three dollars, but whether it shall be uniformly three or whether it shall return to the old law which makes it not greater than three nor less than one, or whether if you adopt this amendment which practically throws the matter wide open and returns it to the discretion of every town, whether they shall have a poll tax or not.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Caribou (Mr. Irving) I will say that there are men everywhere who are jumping their taxes, paying no poll tax or property tax, and who put their property away where you cannot reach it.

Mr. SARGENT of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the poll tax is one of the most unjust taxes that we ever had. It makes the man who cannot earn more than fifty cents or a dollar a day pay just as much as a man who gets \$20 or \$25 a day. It is unjust, and if we are going to make a uniform tax let us make it at one dollar.

Mr. ROLFE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, the position I take upon this question is this, that the younger men growing up have manhood enough about them that they want to pay something towards helping the community in which they reside. I think that is the first element of the poll tax question. I don't assume for a moment that any young man growing up wishes us to exempt him from helping in that matter. The question of the gentleman from Caribou (Mr. Irving) makes it very much complicated for the assessors in the different towns to assess the tax, which may be \$2.50 in one town or \$3.00 and \$2.00 in another town. For example, a man having property back in a town, if he is so unfortunate as to own real estate, he may be paying \$100, \$200 or \$300 tax in that town and he has no privileges and gets no direct results from the improvements, the schools or roads or anything in that town, while the man who simply pays

a poll tax is getting all the benefits that any man living in that town can get. I take it that all men are willing to contribute a small proportion of their earnings for the support and for the good of the community; and therefore I am in favor directly of a uniform tax, and I think three dollars is low enough for the tax.

Mr. DURGIN of Milo: I want to say a word why I am in favor of a uniform poll tax. East of the town of Milo is the plantation of Lake View and many of our young men work there. They have no family; they are transients. They are there the first day of April, and work in the factories and shops there, and are assessed a poll tax of \$2. Our assessors assess a poll tax of \$3 and later, when they attempt to collect it, the young men come up and say, "I have a receipt for my poll tax, I paid it at Lake View." The town of Brownville, north of us, my recollection is they have a \$2 poll tax, and the same question arises as to the young men working there, and while there is no doubt that the young men's tax should be paid in the town of Milo, yet you will see at once it would cost ten times as much to collect it as the town would get back. The fellow has paid his tax and he has shown his receipt; they simply lose the tax. It seems to me in view of this question which arises so frequently in towns that there should be a uniform poll tax. It works no hardship upon any one. Three dollars is not so large that any young man, or any poll tax payer, would need to throw up his head very much to have to pay. It seems to me we could get rid of this difficulty and mix-up of paying tax in one town when he ought to pay it in another; and so I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. PLUMMER of Lisbon: There are one or two points brought up here which it seems to me are very easily met. The question of dodging tax has been brought up here—that a man will move to some other town. So far as I know, by the laws of the State of Maine, a man has a right to live where he wants to in this State, or even to leave it; and if he sees fit

to live in some particular town by reason of the fact that the poll tax is lower there, or to claim his residence there by reason of the fact that the poll tax is lower than in the town which thinks it ought to have his money, why all that town has to do to get him back, or to hold him at least, is to put the tax down. It need not legislate that the other towns put its tax up.

Now, another thing has been stated by the gentleman; that no young man wants to be exempt. There is nothing in this amendment that exempts people from a poll tax unless it is so voted in a town. As to a man paying a tax in another town for which he gets no benefit, it looks to me like a man showing poor business judgment, and I do not know that more legislation of uniform poll tax, and that is all it wanted, why did not it put it down to one dollar, which is the law limit now, or why, even, did it not put it at two dollars, which is the medium limit, and which many of the large cities and towns in the State—Portland, and I think Lewiston and Augusta—charge? Why did not it put it at that? No; it saw fit to take the extreme that the present law allows. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, that there is no man within the sound of my voice here, or outside of it either, that can give any reason why a poll tax should be \$3 rather than \$2 or \$1 or \$10; and there is no man, so far as I ever knew, that attempted to reason it out in a logical manner. Many of us went into our town meetings, last Monday, and we raised a certain amount for expenses for the coming year. On the first day of April, and thereafter, the selectmen of the town will go around and will place a valuation upon the property of the town. Taking out this poll tax, whatever it may be, the remainder will be assessed against the estates of the town, and will be arrived at by a logical and mathematical process. That is to say, as you all know, the selectmen, or assessors, will divide the amount raised by the total valuation, and that will give them the rate on the dollar or on

the thousand. Having taken that, they say to A, B, C and D figuring up the valuation of your property your tax is so much. I will not now say that is a just tax; but I say there is a way that it can be arrived at mathematically; but I say that there is no man here that can tell why he thinks a poll tax ought to be three dollars, or two dollars, or one dollar, or any other number of dollars. You can ask yourself, gentlemen, the question. If you can answer that question fairly in your own minds, then vote to put the poll tax wherever you think it ought to be. If you cannot answer that question fairly in your own minds, and give yourself a satisfactory reason—a logical reason—a reason that you can define logically and mathematically, then at least vote, if you cannot vote to dispense with the poll tax altogether, to give any town that finally concludes it is wise enough—if wise it be—and honest enough—if honest it be—to follow out its own conclusion; any town that cannot see why a poll tax should be three dollars, two dollars, or one dollar, let that town decide for itself that it won't have a poll tax or that it will fix it at that rate or amount at which it does arrive by such reasoning as it can utilize. On the vote I call for yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, demands the yeas and nays. Those favoring the demand will rise and stand in their places.

A sufficient number not having arisen,

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The question being upon the adoption of the amendment A,

Mr. Newbert of Augusta called for a division.

A division being had, 43 voted in favor of the adoption of the amendment, and 65 against.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. Plummer then offered House Amendment B, to amend by striking out the word "three" and inserting in place thereof the word "one" in the fifth line of Section 1 and 2.

The question being on the adoption of House Amendment B,

A division was had, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. Plummer then offered House Amendment C, to amend by striking out the word "three," wherever it occurs in Section 1 and 2, and inserting in place thereof the word "one".

Mr. NEWBERT of Augusta: I do not object to the two dollar tax, because it is what we are living under in this city, but I do object to a uniform poll tax, and I move that the bill and amendment be laid upon the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is bill, an Act to provide for the State certification of all teachers in the public schools. The pending question is the third reading of the bill.

Mr. JONES of China: Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the gentleman from Bethel, (Mr. Bowler) it was decided that we should consider this question, this morning. Before he came to me I had intended to have this matter specially assigned for some day next week, but as he was willing to take it up, this morning, I think it would be well to clean up our calendar as fast as we can.

Mr. Speaker, this act is one that is very important; it is important, as I consider it, especially to the rural districts. This is House Document No. 238, and I wish to take a little of the time of the House in reading from it. The first part of the bill perhaps need not be read. I wish to call attention to Section 3, which is as follows:

"Sect. 3. Certificates of qualification signed by the State superintendent of public schools shall be granted to all candidates who pass satisfactory examinations in such branches as are required or permitted by law to be taught in the public schools and who in other respects fulfill the proper requirements, provided, however, that no person unless he is 17 years of age and has completed a standard High school or academy course shall be eligible for a certificate. Such certificate shall be either probationary or permanent and shall indicate the grade

of schools which the person named therein is qualified to teach. Provided, however, that the certificate may be granted without the examination herein prescribed to graduates of colleges and Maine State Normal schools, or of other normal training schools having a two-years course for graduates of High schools or academics, and to teachers of two years' service and satisfactory fitness, on the presentation of such evidence of fitness and under such special conditions as the State superintendent of public schools may prescribe. Provided, further, that certificates may, under the rules prescribed by the State superintendent, be granted to persons holding State certificates granted by authority of other states. Provided, further, that any certificate granted under this or any preceding act may for sufficient cause be revoked and annulled."

Section 4 of the bill provides as follows:

"Sect. 4. A list of persons so certified shall be kept in the office of the State superintendent of public schools and copies of the same with such information as may be desired shall be sent to school committees and superintendents upon their request."

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I wish to appeal to you for your candid consideration of this matter. It is a matter which affects every town in the State of Maine, especially the rural sections of our State where the young men and young women are growing up to manhood and womanhood, and who are being educated as best they can in those rural sections. And can you deny them the privilege of going into a school and teaching when the superintendent of those schools says that they are qualified? Are you going to legislate this right out of the hands of the people of the towns? They have the right now to certify a teacher, after an examination, after they think that she is qualified to perform the duties in any particular school in that town. I submit, that the law as it is now is ample and is just, and to legislate this out of the hands of the towns and putting it under the control of one man is a very drastic measure.

There are many things to be considered in connection with this matter, things that you should look at carefully

and candidly. I am from a town and I am not ashamed of it, and I am going to stand for the interests of the towns. We have these young men and young women who desire to teach school, those people who will not go before the State superintendent in order to get a certificate, but who will go before the superintendent of their town who is amply qualified to do justice by the schools of that town. Does the State superintendent of schools pretend to know more about your schools in your town, 50 miles or 100 miles from here, than do your own people, your superintending school committee and your supervisor? No, I say he does not. But are we to come here or to any place in the State of Maine that he may designate, and bow before him and ask for a certificate?

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I claim it is an injustice to the young men and young women who are growing up in our State. Perhaps my opponents in this case will argue that other states have it. That is very true. Other states have a law to execute a man for murder by electricity or by hanging, but does the State of Maine have it? Not at all. We have sent from this State of Maine, from our good old Pine Tree State, into other states of this Union men who have been honored and respected before the country, men who have made honored teachers, and yet they never had a certificate from the State superintendent of public schools of the State of Maine. They are just as competent to go forth and teach in the public schools, in the colleges and academics as they ever were. I want to appeal to you, gentlemen, to do justice by these towns. Give them the right to certify any teacher that may come before them, any teacher who is qualified to perform the duties in their schools.

There is appended to this measure, Mr. Speaker, the sum of \$1000, which is taken out of the common school fund which should go to educate those children. What is this for? Hasn't the State superintendent of schools, today, a salary sufficient without taking this money away from the poor children? I am sincere in this matter, gentlemen, but I claim that the cities will benefit where the towns will be deprived of it. You know, and I know that at the

present time, as the country towns are situated, that it costs a great deal of money to transport these children in the country schools, something which the cities do not have to bear in the way of expense. The children are losing the benefit of that money which is to go into the cost of transportation. I am going to be very brief, as I told you, but I am going to leave it entirely in your hands, for you to do as in your wisdom you will see fit to do. Mr. Speaker, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to tire the House in relation to this matter, but I only wish to say that I do not agree with the gentleman from China (Mr. Jones). If the superintendent of schools in every town in this State were qualified to know what was required of a good teacher, I would have no objection. But I hardly believe, Mr. Speaker, that every superintendent of schools in our State is qualified. I believe this provision is a good one. I have observed sometimes that teachers are employed just because they belong to particular families, and I have no doubt but in a great many cases towns have received very poor teachers. I believe the rural schools have just as good teachers as the schools in cities, and as I say, I believe this is a good provision.

Mr. BOWER of Bethel. Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House: We are all a bit tired, and I do not propose to inflict a speech upon you at this time I can agree with the gentleman from China that the question that we have before us for consideration is an important one. He says that it is an important one because it deals with the teachers of our district schools—of our rural schools—and I want to tell you, gentlemen, that it seems to me that it is an important one because it treats or deals with the boys and girls of those rural schools. Now, he has told us, or has pictured to us, that out from those district schools have gone men who have shone in the firmament of progress in other states; but he does not tell us that back in the highways and byways there are thou-

sands and thousands of men and women who have not been able to shine in the firmament of progress of other states because their educational advantages have not been what they should have been. Now, gentlemen, I stand before you, this morning, as a living example of one of these men. I know what it is to be born back here in one of these country towns. I know what it is to grow up to the age of 16 or 17 years and have nothing but what little education I could pick up from a girl perhaps a year above me—a year older at least; just these same kind of teachers that the gentleman from China is picturing to us, this morning. He talks about taking the power from the superintendents of our schools. I have in mind now one superintendent of schools that lives next to me. I do not want to get too near home; it is quite a ways from me; but I am going to tell you, gentlemen, he cannot reckon the simple interest on a promissory note, and yet he is defining the qualifications of teachers that will teach his boys, and my boys, and the other fellow's boys. These things ought not so to be. Gentlemen, we must let this question rest upon its merits. It is no argument to say that the city is getting more advantages than the country, or anything of that kind. We, gentlemen, are all citizens of the old State of Maine, and I trust we are all interested in this great cause of education; and I trust we will do our duty in relation to the educational system of our State and will hold up the State's hands as best we can in educational matters. Now, this bill that has been before our educational committee simply provides, as has been said, and the gentleman from China has read the bill, that there be some standard of certification in our schools; and what better hands can we place it in to determine that standard than our educational department? Where shall we place it? Shall we place it in the hands of 525 superintendents scattered over the State; in men who have obtained their office largely through politics? You gentlemen who come from the country know

something about the qualifications of these people I have referred to. Now, where shall we place it, if we have the interests of the boys and girls of Maine at heart? If we do believe in the future, in the growth and progress of our State, and if we do want to see our boys and girls educated and stand shoulder to shoulder with the boys and girls of other states? What shall we do, gentlemen? We shall give them a better grade of teachers than they are having at the present time; and it is for this purpose only that we ask you to support this bill. All the purposes of this bill is for that end. Now, as I said before, this has been before our educational committee; we have considered it honestly, earnestly and carefully, and we have reported upon it unani- mously. Stop and think for one moment that the State of Maine is spending, today, \$3,000,000 for education; and I want to remind you that this \$3,000,000 comes from direct taxation; I want to remind you that there is not another State in this Union in which there is such a direct tax for education; and this must be said in credit of the State of Maine. I want to say in connection with this, there are but three other States in this Union in which there is not an educational standard defined by the educational departments of these states. In other words, there is a system of State certification in every other state in this Union but four. And shall this State appropriating, as it does, \$3,000,000 by direct taxation, have nothing to say concerning the qualifications of the teachers that shall have charge of our schools? Is this right, gentlemen? We are boasting of our progress. We are looking to progress along the lines of medicine, science and agriculture, orcharding, and all sorts of things. We are not crying those things down. We have State boards of examiners. Doctors cannot practice without an examination; the dentists cannot; lawyers cannot, etc., and so on. But how about the teachers, in whose hands you and I have committed all that the world holds dear to us. These teachers are moulding and shaping the destiny of your boys and mine. Have we

any doubt in this matter? Should we not consider this; and is it asking too much to say that our educational department, in whom we put all confidence—because I am not going to have anybody stand up here and cry down the head of our educational department. You and I, gentlemen, pride ourselves in this fact,—that the man who stands at the head of our educational department in this State stands without a peer in the educational circles of this county. (Applause.) And, gentlemen, I say we shall do well if we put this matter in the hands of our educators. They study our propositions, and they know what the schools of Maine want. I need not say anything more along this line. I am going to leave the matter in your hands. I am going to depend upon the intelligence and fairness of this House. I am sure that you people are interested in the cause of education, and that you understand the force of this bill and can readily appreciate the fact that it will prove of positive value to our Maine schools if enacted into law; and I know you are going to place yourselves, today, on record as standing with the other states of this nation, who have taken this advanced step in education. In full confidence that you will act fairly and wisely I leave the matter in your hands, and I trust the motion of the gentleman from China will not prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. COOK of Vassalboro: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to say much upon this question, but there are a few minor features which have been brought out to which I will refer. This bill before the House is an administration bill, it comes from the State educational department, and it has been thought out and wrought out with much care, not after a few days, but after a few weeks or a few months. It has been a long time in the consideration of that department at the head of which, as the gentleman from Bethel (Mr. Bowler) said, we have a man to be proud of, a man who is recognized throughout the country in educational circles as a leader. And wouldn't you rather entrust the certification of teachers in your town, the

rural towns especially, to the guidance of such a hand?

As it is now, in the rural towns they get along as cheaply as they can. Some child, who is a little brighter than her school mates, is invited to teach the school, and she leaves her classes and turns around and faces the scholars and goes to teaching when she should be at the desk as a pupil for two years longer or four years longer; and when she comes before these rural boards for examination she gets about as much of an examination as she would if they had simply asked her, "How old is Ann?" That is to say, she gets no examination at all. The gentleman from China (Mr. Jones) seems to think and tries to make you think that this is something against the rural school. Why, bless you, the whole inception of the thing is in favor of the rural schools, in favor of the country towns rather than in favor of the city schools. In the city schools their teachers are sufficiently educated and sufficiently examined, and it is just simply to help out the country towns.

Someone has introduced a bill for a minimum wage, but I claim it is too early now for a minimum wage. These rural teachers are getting all they are worth today; you don't want to raise their salary because they are not worth it, and they are not worth what they are getting in many and many of these country schools. For what reason do you want to make a minimum wage for these teachers who are not worth their salt? First get this bill through and let it be in operation for a series of years until we have gotten teachers who are worth more pay, and then we will put in a bill providing for a minimum wage. Let us not get the cart before the horse.

This does not come on suddenly, as you will see by the bill, upon the towns before they are prepared for it. The bill provides for a future application of its provisions, so that we can get ready for it. It provides that teachers already in service can keep on, so that it shall not be a hardship to these country towns. Now, as has been said, the State of Maine is pouring out money in vast quantities to educate the children of

these country schools, and will you have it wasted as it is being wasted now or will you put some kind of a test upon it, so that it can be spent wisely and so that we can get value for the dollars we are putting out. You wouldn't have to come here to Augusta as the gentleman from China (Mr. Jones) implies, you wouldn't have to come to the State superintendent to get your examination, to get your State certificate, but you could take those examinations in the rural towns, and the examinations there will be before the local boards, but they should be examinations such as are examinations and not a farce of an examination such as we have been having. (Applause.)

Mr. O'CONNELL of Milford: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to speak in regard to section five of this bill. Some of my constituents have mentioned the matter to me and have asked me to oppose it. This section mentions cities, towns and plantations in this State. There is a question whether a school in a plantation can be handled the same as a school in a city. In some of the plantations they have schools with only four or five pupils; it is a State school and they draw State money. Where are you going to get a teacher who has passed an examination and who has a State certificate, who will go into a town or plantation with just a few pupils and with a school which is kept open for only three months of the year?

There are girls who have been to High school three years and who, during their vacations, go to these plantations and teach, and they are glad to get them in the plantations, and they are recommended by the principals of the High school, and they are glad to get them from the fact that they cannot get anybody else. Nobody knows better how to control the schools in the small towns than the school board of that town. There may be some members of the school board who are not qualified, but the voters have an opportunity to discover that fact. When you stop and think of 600 cities, towns and plantations in this State, the teacher who passes an examination for a State certificate is not going in there to those plantations for three, four or five dollars a week, and the teacher is not going

to have a State certificate for four or five little children. I should almost favor this bill being referred back to the committee. That word "plantations" does not belong in that bill. You cannot handle plantations and cities and handle them alike. You already have a bill introduced in this House that says the school mill tax shall be apportioned by the attendance of your scholars and not be the number of scholars in the town. It is not an equalization of the school tax, and when you leave that word "plantations" in there it is an injustice. I have nothing to say in regard to the requirements of the school committee; I have nothing to say about our State superintendent of schools, but there is no one man in this State who can control all these schools and especially the smaller schools, and where are you going to get a teacher with a State certificate to go away up into northern Maine and teach school for \$15 or \$18 a week? I think there should be a sliding scale on this bill, cities or large towns on one scale and plantations on the other. I think the bill is unfair, and I think the gentleman from China (Mr. Jones) has taken a good stand, a stand for the people who cannot afford to send their children to a city and who cannot get a teacher for their school if you put this bill through.

Mr. MATHIESON of Rangeley: I believe this bill will work a hardship in the sections mentioned by the gentleman across the way (Mr. O'Connell). We have a system now of certification. Of course it is not compulsory, and I do not believe in making it compulsory for the very reason that most any young man or woman who is trying to fit themselves for teachers will be willing to take the examination without being obliged to. Today I think it is a fact that in our Normal schools we have the primary and intermediate grades in these for these young people to practice upon and train themselves. Would you oblige them to have a certificate before they could do that? I think this measure will certainly work a considerable hardship in the plantations; and I do not see why the young men or young women in these remote sections should not have a chance to try and see if they can fit themselves so as to enter our Normal schools and pursue the higher course. As I have

said, we have today in our Normal schools these classes for them to practice upon; and by this bill, it seems to me, that in order to do so they would have to get a certificate before they could go on with their work. I think this is loosely drawn, and ought to be re-committed.

Mr. BOWLER of Bethel: I think it is necessary to make a bit of explanation in regard to this bill further, the question having been raised that we cannot get the teachers up there in the plantations. I have a lot of these plantations in my county, and I find they are pretty progressive up there and are looking for good teachers, and usually get good teachers up there. Let us remember that we have now a law which allows the State certification of teachers; and for the past few years examinations have been held through this State, as you know, and many of our teachers have already taken advantage of these examinations, and today hold State certificates. It is only to the few who have not done that that this bill applies. I may say that we have today in the State of Maine about 600 teachers out of 7000 in our schools who have not further education than they could obtain in the common schools. This bill is not directed at them particularly, but it is to make it possible that we may remove those teachers who are not sufficiently qualified to teach school. There is one thing more we want to remember in regard to it, and that is this: That any boy or girl who has already taught two years is entitled to receive a State certificate without taking an examination. There are a lot of girls teaching today who ought not to be teaching; but if they hold their job down for two years it will be presumed that they have some qualifications for teaching, and in order that we may keep this supply of teachers we are talking about we have said this: That any person who has taught two years need not take the examination. If you will look at the bill carefully you will find it is mild and will not bring injury upon anybody; but it is simply a bill that provides some start towards having a State board that shall determine the qualifications of those who teach our boys and girls.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Milford: Mr.

Speaker, we already have a law that requires State teachers to have certificates. If that law exists, what is the object of this law? This bill provides in Section 6, as follows:

"Whoever teaches a public school without first obtaining a State teacher's certificate or a temporary teaching permit as herein provided, forfeits not exceeding the sum contracted for his daily wages, for each day he so teaches, and is barred from receiving pay therefor."

As the law exists, today, all teachers in large towns, or towns of medium size, have their certificates, and if they do not have them somebody has not done their duty, and they should have them. The cities and towns are not liable to a fine, but the teachers in the small schools are liable to a fine because they know that these young girls cannot pass an examination required in order to teach school in a city like Augusta or Bangor. This bill is aimed at the small towns, and I think it is your business, gentlemen, to defeat this measure and support the motion of the gentleman from China (Mr. Jones).

Mr. PEACOCK of Readfield: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that for 20 years I have had a practical experience in school affairs in the country. I know nothing about the schools in the cities; I believe in everything that is progressive along educational lines, and everything that will benefit our boys and girls. I believe in the provisions of this bill, but I want briefly to call attention to one section which I think is a trifle vicious. This bill provides that every one obtaining a certificate must be a graduate of a High school or a Normal school or a teacher of recognized standing. In Section 5 of this bill it provides that the State superintendent may admit a teacher to teach for one year, or, in other words, on satisfactory evidence may issue a non-renewable certificate for one year. I think that section is a little vicious for the reason that if a person obtaining a temporary certificate for one year and making good, I can see absolutely no reason why that person should not be permitted to con-

tinue in our schools. It seems to me that is a vicious provision and should be eliminated.

I want to say that from my personal experience I know that the girl or the boy who holds a certificate or a diploma from a High school or Normal school is not always qualified to teach. I know from my own experience that some of the boys and girls who have come from the rural towns of the State of Maine and who have never seen the inside of a Seminary or Normal school have made some of the best teachers who ever stood in the State of Maine, and so successful were they in their work that they were called to Massachusetts and to other states.

Now, gentlemen, the certification of a teacher who is a graduate of a High school or Normal school never made a teacher in this world and never will. I am in favor of this bill, provided that this clause in Section 5 be omitted. And I want to say right here that if I thought this bill was a solution of all the difficulties which we encounter in our towns and would cause our superintending school committees to be upon a higher plane and do all the things that ought to be done to make our schools better, I would not ask for this provision to be eliminated. But I am going to ask that this matter be either tabled for a week or that it be recommitted to the committee with the idea of improving the provisions of Section 5. I am not opposing the bill, and as I say, I believe in progress, but my belief is founded upon this fact, that you cannot shove upon the people of the State of Maine or any other state a law so drastic that they will accept it without a murmur. If this clause in Section 5 is changed in some way you will find that the people in the rural sections of our State will accept it.

I want to say right here also, Mr. Speaker, and it is a matter that every teacher knows, that the time when you need the best teacher is when your boys and girls are young; if they get started right and if they have good teachers when they first go into the schools they will get a foundation that

will insure future success; but if you get a poor teacher you will have poor pupils. So, gentlemen, don't be afraid to put in high priced teachers for your small children, because I believe that is the foundation of the whole thing; and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that this matter be tabled in order that an amendment may be offered.

Mr. KEHOE of Portland: I have never been a school teacher. I have no special object in this bill; but I think after we have had two hours' discussion on any matter, or an hour and a half, at the present time of this session we ought to dispose of this matter. If we put all the bills that come before us on the table, and wait until every member is absolutely satisfied with every section, we will sit here until next July. I think there should be some limit to this matter. I believe that the men who are in favor of the principles of the bill should vote for it, and that those who are opposed to the principles of the bill should vote against it. I believe in having the educational lines the best we can procure for the cities, towns and plantations. I do not believe in making the plantations the dog in this matter, and in trying it out on the dog. I believe the plantations should have the same protection the towns and cities have. My brother from Milford (Mr. O'Connell) read a part of Section 5; but he did not read the whole of it. He raised the objection that the plantations could not afford to have certified teachers. If he had read the next clause he would have found that it provided "that any person not holding a State certificate may be granted not more than one temporary non-renewable teaching permit for a period not to exceed one year, such permit to be issued upon examination by the superintendent of schools of the town." That would be the superintendents of schools in the plantations. That entirely meets his objection. On the other hand, my brother from Readfield (Mr. Peacock) thinks that is a vicious proposition. So you can see how hard it is going to be to meet all the objections. I say it is too late to put it on the table, and

I hope the matter will be disposed of, this morning.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Readfield (Mr. Peacock) that the matter be laid upon the table, which motion is not debatable. All those in favor of the motion that the matter be laid upon the table will say yea; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

The SPEAKER: The question now recurs upon the motion of the gentleman from China, Mr. Jones, that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Jones of China moved that the yeas and nays be ordered, and subsequently withdrew his motion.

The SPEAKER: Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from China, Mr. Jones, that this bill be indefinitely postponed, will rise and stand until counted.

A division being had, 13 voted in the affirmative and 75 in the negative.

So the motion was lost.

The SPEAKER: The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Bethel (Mr. Bowler) that this bill receive its third reading and be passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Jones of China moved that the bill be laid upon the table pending its third reading.

The motion was lost.

Mr. BOMAN of Vinalhaven: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, I would move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the motion is in order.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was lost.

The SPEAKER: Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Bethel (Mr. Bowler) that this bill receive its third reading and be passed to be engrossed will say yes; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken,

The motion was agreed to, and the bill received its third reading and was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is resolve in favor of paying certain bills contracted for

placing a rail in the rear of the House of Representatives, and marking the members' desks. This bill was tabled on motion by the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Scates, the pending question is reference to the committee.

Mr. Austin of Phillips moved that the resolve be referred to the committee on appropriations and financial affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER: The next matter for consideration is the majority and minority reports of the committee on taxation to which was referred Order, "for investigation of taxation of money invested in real estate mortgages, and considering whether or not Chapter 179 of the Public Laws of 1911 should be repealed and reporting by bill or otherwise," majority reporting, "legislation inexpedient," minority reporting "Bill, An Act to repeal Chapter 179 of Public Laws of 1911, providing for the exemption of Mortgages on Real Estate from Taxation." The pending question is the adoption of either of these reports.

Mr. Irving of Caribou moved that the majority report be accepted.

Mr. PUTNAM of Houlton: Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty important question and I think it ought to be discussed more or less before the House votes upon it. I had hoped to survive this session without attempting to make a speech; but this matter is of such vital importance to the township which I represent and to the poor man and the man of moderate means all over this State that I can hardly refrain at this time from putting myself on record with something beside a mere vote.

The question has engaged the attention of several sessions of the Legislature. Two years ago a law was enacted exempting from taxation money at interest secured by mortgage upon real estate. At this session of the Legislature an order was introduced and passed which instructed the committee on taxation to inquire into the advisability of repealing the law which was enacted two years ago. The committee on tax-

tion gave a public hearing on this matter, and there appeared at that hearing in favor of the present law several bankers and real estate brokers from the city of Portland, and a gentleman from Bangor, an eminent gentleman who is worth his hundreds of thousands. They appeared there, as they said, representing the cause of the poor man, the widow and the orphan. In fact, so persistent were they in referring to the widows and orphans that it struck me that the Act was misnamed, and that it should have been named "an Act for the benefit of widows and orphans."

Now, the chief argument which has been urged every time this question has been discussed is that to tax mortgages and also tax the property described in the mortgage is double taxation. As I understand it, double taxation is when you tax the same piece of property twice when it ought only to be taxed once. In this particular instance we have two distinct classes of property, personal property on the one hand and real estate on the other. The fact that a mortgage is personal property is well established; it is evidenced by the fact that upon the death of a man his mortgage goes to the administrator or the personal representative rather than to the heirs direct; and when a mortgage was taxed it was always taxed where the mortgagee resides, regardless of the description of the property in the mortgage.

And if you will bear with me for a moment, I will read an expression from an opinion of one of the courts of this country, in discussing a mortgage in this way:

"Being thus a species of property distinct from other property, its owner or holder, when residing within the State, is assessed and taxed as the owner of money in use, and not upon an interest in the land, which is merely pledged as security for the return of the money loaned. Land is useful and productive, and its value is estimated, for the purposes of taxation, in accordance with its income and usefulness. So a mortgage represents a debt which has value and produces an income, and its value should be esti-

mated accordingly, for like purposes. The products of the soil constitute the income of the owner. The interest on the money loaned constitutes the income of the holder of the mortgage. The two species of property are entirely separate, represent different values; and, on principle, it would seem, each should contribute a just share of the burdens of government, however difficult it may be in practice to have each owner do so."

Now, in regard to the question of double taxation—and so far as I can find, there is nothing illegal about double taxation. I find in Lawyer's Reports Annotated where the question was summed up as follows:

"The great weight of authority holds, as a legal proposition, that the taxation of the mortgage to the mortgagee and of the real estate at its full value to the mortgagor or owner does not constitute double taxation.

It seems to me that a poor man has just about enough to do to pay his bills; he has his tax to pay and he has to borrow money to pay interest, and it would seem in all equity and justice that the money lender or the rich man, whichever you may term him, should pay his just proportion of the tax.

Another argument which has been advanced in favor of the present law was that if you exempted the mortgages from taxation you would necessarily lower the rate of interest. I talked with the register of deeds of Aroostook county the other day and he told me that the rate of interest at the present time was greater than it was two years ago, before this law was enacted. This law gives a great opportunity to a man to dodge his taxes if he wants to. For instance, for the purposes of illustration, I might borrow \$10,000 from our honorable Speaker. I might give him back a mortgage covering a plot of land worth \$5. Now that money which he loaned me, and for which he is receiving 6 per cent. or 8 per cent. interest is entirely exempt under that. I would like to give you a practical illustration of the working of this law. In the year 1911 in the town of Houlton there was the sum of \$314,500 of money at interest which was taxed. This new law entirely eliminated that property,

and there was just one of two things for the town to do, either to raise the valuation or its rate of taxation. It was necessary on the same basis to raise the rate of taxation five mills.

Now, gentlemen, it seems to me that the members of this House will not return to their constituents and tell them that they voted in favor of a law which took from the shoulders of the rich man his just share of taxation and placed an additional burden on the shoulders of the poor man; and, Mr. Speaker, I move that when a vote is taken on this question that it be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. ROLFE of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I won't be very long in what I have to say. You will remember that the Good Book says that "Every way of man seemeth right in his own eyes." Now, looking at this question from my standpoint, I look at it in this way, that no law in the State of Maine has ever been enacted that has done so little hurt and so much good to the poorer classes of people in the State of Maine as has the present law which we are now discussing. Any man if he has money to invest can at the present time invest it in a savings bank with interest at four and one-half per cent., and in the average towns in the State of Maine the average rate of taxation is almost two cents. Now, what in the name of common-sense is the use of a man lending another one money at six per cent. and paying a tax of more than two per cent. when he can invest it in the savings banks and pay no tax and get four and a half per cent? It resolves itself right down to this one thing, that he can loan his money upon real estate to any worthy man at a lower rate of interest under the present existing law than he could if you were to do away with this law. Beside that, gentlemen, if the people of Aroostook county cannot hire money for less than they have in years back, then I say they had better move out of Aroostook county into other parts of the State, where you can do so, because this condition exists in no other part of the State of Maine as far as my knowledge goes.

If you were to repeal this law at the present time you would place very many hardships upon the men who have mortgaged their property at the present time. For this reason many people who have money in the savings banks have taken it out and loaned it at the rate of six per cent. If this law is repealed they may force the man to pay it back and it would create a hardship upon him, in order to place it back in the savings bank where he does not have to pay a tax.

Mr. MARSTON of Skowhegan: Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Rolfe) that there is one other community beside Aroostook county where the facts, as stated by the gentleman from Houlton, are true, and that is in Somerset county. I am not going to make any speech upon this matter, but I hope that the motion will not prevail.

Mr. AUSTIN of Phillips: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss this matter at length, neither from the position that this is a poor man's legislation nor a rich man's legislation, but I want to call the attention of the members of the House to just what were the provisions of the law of 1911. Chapter 179 says that Section 6 of Chapter 9 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding at the close of said Section the following paragraph: "All loans of money made by an individual or corporation and secured by mortgage on real estate situated in this State."

Now, I submit that according to the letter of that law all loans of money made by an individual or corporation and secured by mortgage—whether or not it is pretty good reasoning that with a little stretch of the law savings banks and trust companies may and should also be exempt from taxation on the amount of money they have invested in real estate mortgages. As I say, I am not discussing this from the standpoint of a poor man or a rich man. I am simply discussing it from the point of view of one looking at the future revenue of this State. There is now pending before the committee on taxation a bill

which specifically mentions savings banks and trust companies as being exempt, as to their funds invested in real estate mortgages. Why shouldn't they be exempt if a private individual or a corporation is exempt? What would such exemption bring about? It would bring about a loss of revenue to this State of \$70,519. That is something to be considered. Is the man hiring money in any section of the State of Maine, today, getting it even one-half per cent cheaper from the fact that this property is exempt from taxation? If he is not, it is not a help to the borrower of money or the poor man. I will submit to you further whether even the small money lender can be considered in the category of the poor man. Finally, I will submit to you as to whether you can longer compel the trust companies and savings banks of this State to pay a tax of identically the same amount on the same kind of property that private individuals are exempt from paying on.

Mr. SARGENT of Portland: Mr. Speaker, I have had fifty years' experience in hiring money, and for the last thirty years I have hired anywhere from \$10,000 to \$20,000, and I have paid as high as 12 per cent. If you waive this tax on mortgages the man who hires the money has to pay, he has to pay an extra tax. In reality the State is not losing a dollar by repealing this tax on mortgages. I have looked up the assessor's reports, and the argument has been made that if we repealed this tax on mortgages we would lose \$5,000,000, and what is it that they are now paying on money at interest, over \$6,000,000. Take it in the whole State of Maine, and there is more money taxed at interest today than there was in 1906. You may pass all these laws you have a mind to, and you cannot tax the man who lends the money. He won't be taxed. He will take it in the name of somebody in Boston, Chicago, or somewhere else, and dodge the whole thing. I was talking with one of the members of the Aroostook county delegation when we wanted to repeal this law and he said he was going to vote to

take the tax off of the rich man. Some men want to get 12 per cent. for their money. I paid 12 per cent. for money when this law was in existence. Take it thirty years ago, and I guess I paid a tax on 25 per cent. of what I was worth. The State is not losing anything by repealing the tax on mortgages. This was one of the worst laws that we ever had in this State, and we have demonstrated the fact that the State is not losing any money by this measure, but giving it to the poor man.

Mr. IRVING of Caribou: Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested, and I make the motion that the House take a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the House by an order granted the use of the Hall of Representatives to Dr. W. V. Fisher for a lecture this evening.

Mr. IRVING: Then I withdraw my motion, Mr. Speaker. I wish to state now and here that this is not a local issue; it is a State-wide matter, and was considered by the majority of the committee on taxation as such. There appeared in opposition to the repeal of that law as it now exists men from different parts of the State. They were not all bankers and neither were they all wealthy men. The point upon which your committee decided to vote rested upon the effect of the law as generally applied to the State at large. I wish to call attention to the only town in the entire State appearing in favor of the repeal, and it appeared in evidence there, and it has been repeated on this floor, that they were the loser to the extent of five mills valuation in their tax. I simply state that the town of Houlton in 1910 assessed at the rate of 24½ mills, in 1911 at the rate of 24 mills, and in 1910 at the rate of 24 mills.

Now, if the contention of the gentleman from Houlton, (Mr. Putnam) is correct, that it cost an increased five mills, their rate would have been 29 mills. But what in all probability has occurred? It has been proven that the repeal of taxation on mortgages has brought into the town of Houlton and caused investment increasing their valuation so that they did not increase the rate of taxation. That is the contention

that was made by those opposed to the repeal of the law. They removed this burden which ultimately falls upon the borrower, caused money to remain in the State and investments to be made upon property upon which taxation could be had, which becomes a profit to the town. I yield to no man in my desire to have taxation placed upon the wealthy man, if you can accomplish it; but I say that at no time in the history of this or any other country has it ever occurred that you could corner bonds and money, for the simple reason that money is king; it is that which we are all reaching out for; it is that which every industry under the sun is getting incorporated for; it is the whole thing.

In the state of Massachusetts they passed a law taxing equities. The ink was scarcely dry upon the bill enacting that law before the printing presses were striking out instruments in the shape of a new form of mortgage in which was incorporated a clause to the effect that the borrower should pay the tax. Has the law in any single instance succeeded in accomplishing the purpose for which it was originated. In my own personal experience and observation I emphatically state that it has utterly and absolutely failed. It all comes back to the borrower, and he must pay it. The gentleman from Portland (Mr. Sargent), who appeared before our committee, neglected to state in the course of his remarks that while he paid 12 per cent. at one time, he is borrowing all the money he wishes, today, at 5 per cent. In my own town of Caribou they tried to adopt a method by penalizing one or more of our money lenders. They went to the records and found that we had one who had several thousand dollars worth of real estate mortgages, and they penalized him for that, and he went before the selectmen and established the fact that he had disposed of part of them, and that every one of the remaining number had been cut down. Wouldn't it be better that all of this \$70,000,000, which has been mentioned as being invested out of the State, and in all probability invested there because of this tax,—wouldn't it be better that

a portion of that money be brought back into the State for the purpose of developing the State.

It has been said here that we would lose \$75,000. In the event that this bill should be passed exempting savings banks and trust companies from their mortgage loans, in the event that this would open the door to let back into the State \$15,000,000 of the \$70,000,000 invested out of the State, and it would give to the State treasurer \$75,000 and give to the several municipalities of the State four or five times as much tangible property to assess taxes upon. Isn't it better when we realize that we cannot reach this money, that we permit money to be invested and entire money to come back here in order that we may better our State and create more taxable property that will largely benefit the State.

Mr. AUSTIN of Phillips: Mr. Speaker, I think at this stage of the game it will be impossible to get a true and fair sentiment of this House

upon this question which I submit is of great importance to all the people of the State. And on that account, I move that the matter be tabled and be specially assigned for tomorrow morning, and that all other matters which today should automatically come off of the table be tabled and assigned for consideration tomorrow, as well as those matters which were specially assigned for today.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. Plummer of Lisbon moved that the vote be reconsidered whereby the bill relating to the registration of dentists and the organization of the board of dental examiners, was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. Austin of Phillips moved that the motion of the gentleman from Lisbon, Mr. Plummer, be laid upon the table and assigned for consideration, tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. Austin of Phillips, Adjourned.