

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

One Hundred and First Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

MAY 10 - JUNE 22, 1963

and

SPECIAL SESSION

JAN. 6 - JAN. 17, 1964

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Wednesday, January 8, 1964

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Howard O. Hough of Portland.

On motion by Mr. Atherton of Penobscot, the Journal of Monday was read and approved.

Joint Resolutions

Mr. Wyman of Washington presented Joint Resolution Memorializing the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to Remove or to Liberalize the Restrictions on Residual Fuel Oil Imports.

WE, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in Special Session of the One Hundred and First Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, as follows:

WHEREAS, on Monday, December 9th, President Johnson resolved to you the responsibility and role of being the chief agency for petroleum policy matters for the Federal Government; and

WHEREAS, it has been recognized that one of the major burdens placed on both industry and consumers in all of the North Atlantic States has been the restriction on residual fuel imports kept in effect for the past several years; and

WHEREAS, the development and maintenance of the vital economy in the State of Maine is dependent upon a sufficient supply of imported residual fuel oil at competitive prices, be it

RESOLVED: That we recommend and urge to the Secretary of the Interior that appropriate action be taken to either remove or revise present residual fuel oil import restrictions to the end that the best interests of both the consumer and our nation are served, and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted by the Secretary of

State to The Honorable Stewart L. Udall and by the Secretary of State to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives representing Maine in Congress. (S. P. 689)

Which was referred to the Committee on State Government and sent down forthwith for concurrence.

Mr. Hinds of Cumberland presented Joint Resolution Memorializing Maine Congressional Delegation to Oppose New Stringent Requirements in Public Assistance Cases.

WE, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the One Hundred and First Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your Honorable Body as follows:

WHEREAS, the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare requires an increase in the frequency of review of eligibility in public assistance cases and also requires a new system of so-called "quality control"; and

WHEREAS, compliance with these requirements will mean the appropriation of additional State funds in order to continue to operate the public assistance programs under new eligibility standards which are totally inapplicable and transcend the needs and conditions existing in this State; and

WHEREAS, the failure to conform to these Federal requirements will place Maine's public assistance federal matching funds in jeopardy; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That in the stringent requirements by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for increased review of eligibility, as well as the imposition of a new system of "quality control", we recognize a complete disregard of the purposes for which the federal-state assistance programs were designed and the highly impractical and utopian desire on the part of the department to promote the fallacious objective of nation-wide uniformity in Federal assistance requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Legislature of the State of Maine expresses the opinion that these requirements ought not to be imposed upon this or any other State in the absence of their consent, nor under the threat of loss of Federal matching funds if there is non-compliance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States be instructed to oppose the imposition of these requirements upon this State; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this Preamble and these Resolves, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress. (S. P. 690)

Which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

Sent down for concurrence.

Committee Reports

Ought to Pass

Mr. Campbell from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Revise Laws Relating to Support of Patients at State Institutions Under the Control of the Department of Mental Health and Corrections." (S. P. 658) (L. D. 1650) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Edmunds from the same Committee on Bill, "An Act Relating to Lapsing of Appropriation for Legislative Research Committee." (S. P. 660) (L. D. 1652) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mrs. Sproul from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act Permitting Insurance Companies to Join Together to Offer Health Insurance for the Aged." (S. P. 653) (L. D. 1657) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Brown from the same Committee on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Charter of the Union Mutual Life Insurance Company." (S. P. 652) (L. D. 1658) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Hichborn from the Committee on Education on Bill, "An Act to Correct an Inconsistency in the Educational Foundation Program Allowance." (S. P. 650) (L. D. 1656) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Which reports were read and accepted and under suspension of the rules, the bills were given their two several readings, passed to be engrossed and sent forthwith to the House for concurrence.

Mr. Kimball from the Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Increasing the Amount Available for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes. (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1631) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and my distinguished colleagues in this Senate: In moving that this report be accepted I would just like to briefly say that I am very quick at times to criticize people and members of both bodies who are not for or who are not consistently working to help the economy of the State of Maine in both industrial and recreational development and down the line, farming and so on, but in urging that this report be accepted and passed on I do want to praise the leadership of the Democrat Party and the Republican Party who testified before our Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development yesterday down the line, members of the other body's leadership and members of this body's leadership, and it certainly was pleasant to see this entire group as though they were one party come before our committee and definitely show that they were for progress for the State of Maine. I also wish to compliment the Governor in his message for his commending and pushing this program for beet sugar in Aroostook County.

I can remember back in the 100th Legislature that in asking for the MIBA loan to go from one million to two million we had a tremendous battle. It shows to me that this present legislature is starting to get some years ahead of their time, without any question, when they back a bill unanimously to raise this great sum through the MIBA. I would say that although this may seem to be a good deal of money to employ some 250 or 300 people that is just the beginning. From the ramifications of this project, as we saw before our committee, it will mean eventually the employment of several thousands plus the fact that many farms in Aroostook County and farmers as well can now survive and will be showing a profit.

In addition, it has come to my attention already — I have heard it directly and I cannot divulge the name — that a large candy firm will locate probably in Cumberland County if this project is accomplished. I will not tell you the name because I am still trying to get them for York County, but, nevertheless, I understand they may go into Cumberland County.

In closing, I wish to give credit to the entire leadership for backing this bill which, in my opinion, is very, very progressive and will greatly help the economy of the State of Maine, and I sincerely hope will start to stop the one per cent of our population that is leaving the State of Maine; and with this project; and I predicted it just recently — I am hoping that we will not lose 77 per cent of the graduates of the University of Maine to other states and that they can stay in Maine, and that this project is a start towards it. Thank you for your indulgence.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, on behalf of the Aroostook delegation in both branches may I humbly and gratefully thank the Senator from York, Senator Lovell for his very gracious remarks.

Thereupon, the report was read and accepted and under suspension of the rules, the resolve was

given its two several readings, passed to be engrossed and ordered sent forthwith to the House for concurrence.

Mr. Boardman from the Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Permitting Complaint by a County Attorney for Discovery of Property of Deceased Persons or Wards." (S. P. 673) (L. D. 1636) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Cram from the Committee on Municipal Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Increase the Indebtedness of the Town of Canaan School District." (S. P. 668) (L. D. 1639) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Cyr from the same Committee on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Paris Village Corporation." (S. P. 667) (L. D. 1640) reported that the same Ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Ferguson of Oxford, tabled pending acceptance of the report and especially assigned for later in today's session.)

Mrs. Harrington from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill, "An Act Increasing Borrowing Capacity of Ashland Water and Sewer District." (S. P. 648) (L. D. 1654) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Cram from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill, "An Act Relating to Employment of Prisoners." (S. P. 664) (L. D. 1643) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Mr. Pike from the same Committee on Bill, "An Act Authorizing Hancock County to Construct an Addition and Make Renovations to the County Court House." (S. P. 662) (L. D. 1645) reported that the same Ought to pass.

Which reports were read and accepted, the Bills and Resolves read once and under suspension of the rules, the bills were read a second time, passed to be engrossed and ordered sent forthwith to the House.

Ought to Pass — As Amended

Mr. Campbell from the Committee on Appropriations and Finan-

cial Affairs on Bill, "An Act to Appropriate Moneys for Legislative Expenditures." (S. P. 657) (L. D. 1649) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-351)

Mr. Johnson from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill, "An Act to Incorporate the Railroad Workers Credit Union of Maine." (S. P. 651) (L. D. 1659) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-349)

Mr. Whittaker from the Committee on State Government on Resolve, Authorizing the Maine Defense Commission to Convey Certain Land in Gardiner. (S. P. 666) (L. D. 1642) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-348)

(Which report was read and accepted and the bill read once; on motion by Mr. Farris of Kennebec, the bill was tabled pending adoption of Committee Amendment "A".)

Which reports were read and accepted, Committee Amendments "A" were adopted, and the Bills and Resolve, as amended, were read once and under suspension of the rules were read a second time, passed to be engrossed, and ordered sent forthwith to the House.

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Mr. Lovell from the Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Bill, "An Act Increasing Limits of Industrial Mortgage Insurance Under Maine Industrial Building Authority Act." (S. P. 676) (L. D. 1630) reported that the same Ought to pass in New Draft (S. P. 688) (L. D. 1665)

Which report was read and accepted and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read twice, passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

Majority — Ought to Pass Minority — Ought Not to Pass

The Majority of the Committee on Natural Resources on Bill, "An

Act to Promote Mining in the State and Reclassifying Certain Waters in Hancock County." (S. P. 680) (L. D. 1663) reported that the same Ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

FERGUSON of Oxford
COLE of Waldo

Representatives:

WILLIAMS of Hodgdon
JAMESON of Bangor
BURNS of Westbrook
JEWELL of Monticello
SAHAGIAN of Belgrade
DUDLEY of Enfield
CHOATE of Windsor

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

REED of Sagadahoc

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President, I move we accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise somewhat reluctantly this morning to oppose the motion that is now before us and to oppose the author of this legislation, my good "Aloha" traveling companion, the Senator from Hancock. I also feel somewhat reluctant to oppose it because first of all, I am the only one I know of that does oppose it. At the hearing, which was conducted very well, there was no opposition to this bill. I also realize that I will be labeled as a person who is opposed to development of our natural resources, and if not that, will at least be called a starry-eyed idealist but I feel that I am neither. I feel that this bill warrants opposition, and anything in my own mind but what I am doing now, at least for me as an individual would be wrong.

Now I am not opposed to the bill as such. I am opposed to some parts in it and what it does. While I was walking to this hearing, I met Mr. McDonald in our tunnel downstairs and I said, "Well it is in the new building"

and he said, "No it is in the old building." I asked, "Aren't you going to the hearing on Natural Resources?" He said, "No, I am heading for the Appropriations Committee."

The last five years, since 1957, since the Water Improvement Commission has become active in classifying the waters we have spent \$12 million. This is the state's share, the town's share of what the federal government has put in but it has all been spent here. In the next five years, an estimate is roughly \$20 million. This excludes the cost that industry has made in trying to abate pollution and the problem that exists in our streams. And even though we try to correct it and spend this money, the effect would not be as great as if we had faced the problem at the time. So in fact I don't believe that I am being the idealist. I feel that I am trying to be a realist, trying to live up to the problems as they come to us now.

I would like to outline roughly the thing that is now proposed. The Denison Company proposes to take Second Pond, and it is too bad we don't have a map here, and fill this pond with sand, then to put a dam at the end of Second Pond and let the water go down to First Pond and then to Salt Pond. I say let them have Second Pond, let them put their sand in Second Pond, or whatever they filter out. They stand there and they say that the water as it comes over this dam will be clean. It will be a hard water, a neutral water and will not be harmful, not, in a sense, polluted water. And yet, they also say that they do not want First Pond, Salt Pond and the stream classified. It is presently classified B-1. They don't want B-2; they are not happy with C; they are not happy with a D; they want it unclassified. This is the part that I am opposed to. I am also opposed that in all the deliberations that were taking place, only fifteen minutes in the early stages were spent with our Water Improvement Commission. We have a problem.

A department we have created to try to solve this problem and yet they are not — I cannot say not consulted because they were for some fifteen minutes — but at that time the plans were so rough that Mr. McDonald could not really say whether a solution could be met and solved or not. Now the company says that they have to protect their stockholders. They are making a tremendous investment and this I agree on. Therefore they say there might possibly be some pollution go down to First Pond and into Salt Pond. They say that it won't but it might be possible and therefore they want it unclassified to protect their stockholders. Well I say to you that I feel that I am a stockholder and I feel that everyone here in the Senate is a stockholder and we represent stockholders in a pretty important piece of real estate, the State of Maine. I feel that we should have something to say about what takes place.

So my main objection to this bill is that we should be firm. We should try to work with this company. We should do everything we can to bring it in but to say "You write your legislation and we will pass it," I feel is wrong and I basically feel that this is what we have done. I cannot see where in any way shape or manner they have tried to solve the pollution of water in the lower stream. A gentleman there said that he had probably a lot at stake because he got water from First Pond, his source as a reservoir and he felt that it wasn't going to pollute his water and therefore I know, and I know that the Senator from Hancock, Senator Brown feels that no harm is going to be done to the waters below Second Pond. Yet, no one is willing to classify this water so that we can have some control over it. It seemed to be sort of a coincidence, on this stream there is a little operator of a saw mill. At least, economically he is little. We have made him take care of his sawdust waste. Mr. McDonald said this was a thorn in his side for a number of years because he didn't want to. It cost him money.

Finally they made him take and do something with his sawdust. And yet, because a larger company moves in upstream, we immediately say, "Do whatever you want to with it" and this is something that is going to last for ten to twenty years.

I am not saying we should deny 250 to 300 men work between ten and twenty years. We should take what we can get. But I bring this out to point out to you that this is a natural resource; that there is an end to it and then what are we going to do? It seems to me that the most upsetting part of this thing is that Maine again, more or less muffed the ball. We have a chance to extend a hand of welcome but we have a chance to make that a firm hand instead of almost like a jellyfish to be shaken any way they wish. I have nothing against the mining company and, Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division. I realize that probably I will stand alone but I feel that I am justified in doing so because I feel there should be some opposition registered to it.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I did not hear this bill but I did hear some of the comments made by Governor Reed and have seen some writing in the papers about the development of this mining company. I understand it is going to involve the expenditure of many millions of dollars and employment for several hundred people for 15 and possibly 20 years.

Now in the State of Maine we have 2500 ponds and lakes and I think we could sacrifice three or four of them for the next ten or fifteen years for a million dollar payroll coming into Hancock County which is in the depressed area and I certainly am surprised the good Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed—I will admit that they have the Bath Iron Works in his area and probably the people aren't in the condition they are in Hancock County—but I would have to register opposition and vote with the majority of the committee on this bill. In my opinion, I want clean waters too, but on the other hand, with the number of

lakes and rivers we have got in the state we certainly can sacrifice a few of them for a few years if it means employment for Maine people.

Mr. BROWN of Hancock: Mr. President, the objection to this bill from my good friend, Senator Reed, is the classification probably of Third Pond more than any other pond in this area. The company assured us that this pond was removed from classification as it was felt by the company officials that it was possible for a flash flood, or an act of God over which they had no control, to maybe pollute for a small period of time, maybe a few hours, First Pond and possibly Salt Pond but I believe, however, that the mining company involved, assured everybody that barring some unforeseen event like this, that there would be hard, clean water, as Senator Reed has said and I appreciate the Senators objections but I feel that they are unjustified in this case. I think he has pointed out that this does involve 250 or so employees, several million dollars of expenditures to the state, a four million dollar plant and a million dollar payroll and certainly Hancock County needs all of this.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as Chairman of Natural Resources Committee, I must strongly support my position as signer of the Ought to pass report of the committee. I, too, wish we had a map here because it clearly indicates what the Denison Mining Company expects to do, to pump out Second Pond and use it for a settling tank or pond. Going into the pond will be tailings from the ground up minerals taken from the ground and we will have the brook from First Pond, Second Pond and Third Pond so I feel there wont be any danger of any great pollution. As Senator Brown has pointed out, in a flash flood or some such thing it could spill out and carry some of the settling down the stream but it would clear up in a matter of hours or few days. I am somewhat familiar with the mining operations in hardrock mining and I think it is very important that this bill be

passed and in a couple of years if we find that some problem does come up, it could be taken care of at that time.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I would just like to answer a few of the questions that have been brought up. First of all, I would like to again emphasize that we are taking back to our stockholders a promise and they are taking back to their stockholders the law. I think there is definitely a difference. Now they say that there might be flood conditions during which the water would be polluted for several hours or a day or two.

I do not ever believe our Water Improvement Commission, if there was an act of God such as this, would come in and say "The water is polluted, you have got to shut down. I do not believe they are that unrealistic.

Now the Senator from Hancock, Senator Brown, knows better than I, but I take it there are a number of cottages on Salt Pond. The Water Improvement Commissioner is not sure, there is some doubt in his mind what effect this may have on the water in front of those cottages.

I would like to point out again: I am not against the mining company coming in; I am not against setting a precedent. This does not particularly scare me. I realize that somewhere along the line you are going to have to lower classification, but I say let's stop it at Second Pond, let's have it Second Pond. I feel that the problem could be solved right there. I would even support legislation for the State to help this company solve its problem.

Now the Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson, said that several years from now if we find there is pollution we could pass a law stopping it. If I should happen to be here I would be very reluctant to vote for that bill because I feel that we are misleading the Denison Mining Company if we do something like that.

As I said before, I realize that it is a small matter. First Pond is a bog and Second Pond is one also. There is some valuable real estate on Salt Pond. I am prob-

ably just being stubborn, but maybe before we are through this Legislature will prove one thing: that a Reed, whether he comes from the upper part of the State or the lower part and regardless of his party affiliations, he seems to have a stubborn streak in him. I cannot go along with this bill as presently written.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President, I would like to inquire through the Chair of any Senator who can answer this: Has the Maine Water Improvement Commission formally registered protest to this complete removal of classification?

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Farris, poses a question through the Chair to any Senator who may answer if he chooses.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President, not to my knowledge. At the hearing before the Legislative Research Committee they appeared one time and yesterday there was nobody. I saw Mr. McDonald yesterday, who is Chief Engineer for the Water Improvement Commission, and we discussed this briefly. Of course the Water Improvement Commission does not like to see any downgrading, but I gathered from Mr. McDonald he was not too concerned with this because the waters are not used for any boating or bathing and there is no fish life outside of a few pickerel and perch. That is the subject that came up before our committee yesterday, and I do not believe that the Water Improvement Commission at this time is too concerned. That is the impression I got from Mr. McDonald.

Mr. REED of Sagadahoc: Mr. President, I would agree with the Senator from Oxford, however I think that Mr. McDonald, the head of our Water Improvement Commission — I do not wish to say anything to get him into trouble, but I believe he felt as if his hands were tied because the Governor had made the announcement more or less before he knew what was coming off. I just feel that this department should have been worked with very closely. I couldn't be a department head

very long if I had to do what he has done, but this is what he felt he had to more or less do, and I think personally he is rather upset.

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I am for industry in the State of Maine as much as anyone else is, but this "unclassified" bothers me. Immediately I can see several other industries on other rivers hoping that they would be unclassified too. For that reason I feel that I will have to stand with the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Reed.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson, that the Senate accept the Majority Ought to Pass Report. A division has been requested.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty-seven having voted in the affirmative and five opposed, the Majority Report was accepted, and under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its two several readings, passed to be engrossed and ordered sent forthwith to the House for concurrence.

Majority—ONTP

Minority "A"—OTP

Minority "B"—OTP As Amended

The Majority of the Committee on State Government on Bill, An Act Increasing Salaries of Members of Industrial Accident Commission. (S. P. 665) (L. D. 1641) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

WHITTAKER

of Penobscot

CHRISTIE of Aroostook

Representatives:

DENNETT of Kittery

THAANUM of Winthrop

SMITH of Strong

BERRY

of Cape Elizabeth

DOSTIE of Lewiston

CARTIER of Biddeford

One member of the Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported in Minority Report "A" that the same Ought to Pass.

(Signed)

Representative:

BERMAN of Houlton

One member of the Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter, reported in Minority Report "B" that the same Ought to Pass, As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (No. S-350)

(Signed)

Senator:

LOVELL of York

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President, I would like to move that the committee Minority Report "B" be accepted by the Senate and I would like to speak briefly on it. I do not think there will be any opposition to accepting Report "B" actually, and I think it should probably without question go under the gavel but I would like to say a few words on it.

This bill, when it came before the Committee on State Government there was not any particular question from the committee — and there were two absent—I see one man who signed the report who was not there to my knowledge. Nevertheless there was no particular objection or no objection to an increase in salary for the Industrial Accident Commission because in the last session we had increased the salaries of the various heads of departments and the Governor had in turn increased the salaries of the heads of departments that he has charge of increasing salaries. The objection from the rest of this committee was that this was not an emergency bill and should not have been entered. I say the leadership allowed this bill to come in, so to me if you are a good Democrat—and there were Democrats on leadership who allowed the bill in—you should be for this minority report. On the other hand, if you are a good Republican you should vote for this minority report, because the Republican leadership allowed this bill to come in because it was overlooked in the last session, this increase in salaries for the Industrial Accident Commission. And I am sure the good Senator, whom

you may hear from but I doubt—you may hear from the good Senator from Penobscot, Senator Whittaker on his objection. His objection was on the simple fact that it was not an emergency bill, but it was allowed in so I say it was an emergency bill, and I think that deep down in his heart he feels that we are discriminating against this commission because all of the rest of the commissioners wages have been increased in the last session of the legislature. And the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Christie, I think she did not decide until everyone else had decided, and I think that naturally she likes to go against me so she decided the other way, to sign the majority report.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President, I object to these remarks.

The PRESIDENT: The Senate will be in order.

Objection has been made to the Senator's personal reference. I know he understands the reason for the objection and I know that the Senator will cease and desist from further such references. The Senator may continue.

Mr. LOVELL: Thank you, Mr. President. I am extremely sorry if I have offended the good Senator from Aroostook, Senator Christie. I certainly did not mean to offend her. She is a very, very fine lady and I have a great deal of admiration for her and I certainly hope that she is re-elected to the Senate the next session.

As I say, I feel confident that this will without question go under the gavel, but the amendment I have offered I would like to speak briefly on it. The amendment was in regard to the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game. Now the Committee on State Government in their last session did not give a raise to the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game because he was a new man; they felt that he had to prove himself. The Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game is a difficult position. The changes in hunting and fishing laws throughout the State are very diversified. I know that there was a great deal of opposition to him when he went

in as Commissioner, and the Committee on State Government felt that he being a new man—it was not the position particularly—but they felt that he being a new man they should not give him a raise.

Now Commissioner Speers, if this waits until the next regular session, would not get a raise until 90 days after the next session closes, which will be sometime in September, 1965, and his three-year term lapses in April, 1966. Now he has 150 personnel in his department, a large department. He has run it well, it is well-organized and he has had a great deal of good, favorable comment, particularly from my county, and when you can please the hunters and fishermen in my county you are doing quite a job.

Now in his department there is one division head that makes \$65 a week more than he does. There are a number in his department that make as much money as he does, and some a little more. Now the income from the fish and game department is running at the rate of two and a quarter million a year. His increase, and this is earmarked revenue as you all know will come from this earmarked revenue which is approximately one million in reserve. It doesn't come from the general fund. It comes from Inland Fish and Game and from his work, his good work in keeping that fund up.

In past days the Commissioner of Inland Fish and Game used to get the same salary as the Secretary of State I am told. Now the Secretary of State gets \$12,500 and the Commissioner of Inland Fish and Game gets \$10,000. Briefly the average in 1963 of all fish and game departments in the United States Commissioners was \$12,189 to \$12,984 per year. In the State of Virginia, the Commissioner got \$13,500; Connecticut \$13,500; Illinois which is a large hunting state, \$15,000 and Michigan, \$17,500 and this amendment only calls for a \$1500 raise to put our Commissioner of Inland Fish and Game along with the rest of the raises I have here.

Thank you. I hope this will go under the gavel.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I do not rise to debate either side of the issue but merely to defend the screening committee, the Committee on Reference of bills who made decisions as to the legislation that would be before us in this special session. There were three salary bills in, the bill which we have before us to raise the salary of the Industrial Accident Commission, a second one to raise salary of the Commissioner of Inland Fish and Game and a third one to raise the salary of the Adjutant General. The Industrial Accident Commission was not considered in the regular session for salary increase due to an oversight. The person who was supposed to present the legislation slipped up and it never came before the State Government Committee. In the other two instances the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game and the Adjutant General, the bills were considered by State Government and by the legislature and rejected in regular session. Therefore we felt that they could not come before us again in the special session but that the bill to raise salaries of the Industrial Accident Commission should be considered by the special session.

Mr. WHITTAKER of Penobscot: Mr. President, in deference to the oratory of the Senator from York, Senator Lovell, I shall not oppose this bill in its first reading but shall reserve the right to speak before the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Brooks of Cumberland, the bill was tabled pending motion by Senator Lovell to accept the Minority Report B and was especially assigned for the next legislative day.

Mrs. Christie of Aroostook was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President, this is just to set the record straight. This Senator from Aroostook does not vote on personalities. When she votes she votes according to her convictions and not to antagonize or to oppose any individual. I just wanted to make that clear.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair thanks the Senator.

Orders of the Day

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would inquire if Bill, "An Act Providing for Review of Laws of Forestry Department" (H. P. 53) (L. D. 76) is in the possession of the Senate:

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would reply in the affirmative, the bill having been recalled to the Senate as a result of the Joint Order passed on the first legislative day.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, the Senate voted under suspension of the rules, to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was sent forthwith to the engrossing department.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I would inquire whether Bill, "An Act Relating to Loans by Washington County" (S. P. 592) (L. D. 1556) is in the possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would reply in the affirmative, the bill having been recalled by Joint Legislative Order on the first legislative day.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook, the bill was ordered placed in the legislative files.

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook,

Recessed to the sound of the gong.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Papers from the House—out of order

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reports as truly and strictly Engrossed the following Bill and Resolve: Bill, "An Act Increasing Limits of Industrial Mortgage Insurance Under Maine Industrial Building Authority Act." (S. P. 688) (L. D. 1665)

Emergency

A division was held and 27 having voted for and none against,

the Bill was Passed to be Enacted in concurrence.

Constitutional Amendment

Resolve, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Increasing the Amount Available for Guaranteed Loans for Industrial Purposes. (S. P. 677) (L. D. 1631)

Being a Constitutional Amendment, a division was held and 27 having voted for and none against, the Resolve was Finally Passed.

Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS of Aroostook: Mr. President as a spokesman for the Aroostook delegation I would like to say I stand here with a deep sense of humility for the magnificent cooperation which has been shown to Aroostook on these two pieces of legislation which we have just enacted. I am not going to make a long speech but, for the record, I would

like publicly to thank the Senators, members of the House of Representatives, the lobby, the press, and all of the many others interested in the State of Maine, who have worked and worked hard to the end that these bills could be enacted, and I know that we in Aroostook appreciate it very, very much.

The President laid before the Senate Item 6-9 on today's calendar, Committee report on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Paris Village Corporation" (S. P. 667) (L. D. 1640) tabled earlier in today's session by Senator Ferguson of Oxford pending acceptance of the Ought to Pass report; and on further motion by that Senator, the bill was retabled and especially assigned for the next legislative day.

On motion by Mr. Edmunds of Aroostook,

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.