

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

Ninety-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1953

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Saturday, May 2, 1953.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Rev. Ernest B. Johnson of Hallowell.

Journal of yesterday, read and approved.

**Order
(Out of Order)**

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, out of order and under suspension of the rules, it was

ORDERED, the House concurring that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Monday, May 4, 1953 at nine o'clock in the forenoon, Eastern Standard Time.

Sent down for concurrence.

Subsequently the foregoing order was returned from the House, having been read and passed in concurrence.

House Papers

Joint Order recalling (H. P. 830) (L. D. 861) Bill "An Act Relating to Definition of Employer Under Employment Security Law," from the Legislative Files to the Senate. (S. P. 577)

(In Senate on April 30 read and passed.)

Comes from the House, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, tabled pending consideration, and especially assigned for later today.

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on Bill "An Act to Place a Bounty on Porcupines," (H. P. 646) (L. D. 661) reported that they are unable to agree.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Relating to Election of Members of School Board in Town of Camden," (H. P. 144) (L. D. 142) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1282) (L. D. 1522) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Comes from the House, report indefinitely postponed, and subsequently reconsidered, and the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A". (Amendment Filing 443)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Weeks of Cumberland, the report was accepted in concurrence, House Amendment "A" was read and adopted in concurrence under suspension of the rules, and the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Agriculture on Bill "An Act Relating to Adulterated Meat or Meat Products," (H. P. 625) (L. D. 649) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

FULLER of Oxford
TABB of Kennebec
DOW of Lincoln

Representatives:

CENTER of Standish
GOSLINE of Gardiner
BAILEY of Woolwich
BEARCE of Hebron

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1295) (L. D. 1543) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(Signed)

Representatives:

DORSEY of Fort Fairfield
TAYLOR of Norridgewock
EMERSON of Corinna

Comes from the House, the Minority Report accepted, and subsequently the bill indefinitely postponed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Fuller, the bill was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Relating to Charges for Medical Examination by Applicants for Employment," (H. P. 659) (L. D. 702) reported that the same ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin

Representatives:

WEST of Stockton Springs
GATES of Millinocket
SMALL of Mexico
LETOURNEAU of Sanford
COUTURE of Lewiston

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A". (Amendment Filing 411)

(Signed)

Senators:

WARD of Penobscot
REID of Kennebec

Representatives:

LEGARD of Bath
CASWELL of New Sharon

Comes from the House, the Minority Report accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the Minority Report was accepted in concurrence, Committee Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed as amended in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Labor on Bill "An Act Relating to Compensation for Total Incapacity Under Workmen's Compensation Law." (H. P. 428) (L. D. 475) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Amendment Filing 408)

(signed)

Senator:

ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin

Representatives:

WEST of Stockton Springs
LEGARD of Bath
GATES of Millinocket
SMALL of Mexico
LETOURNEAU of Sanford
COUTURE of Lewiston

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "B". (Amendment Filing 409)

(signed)

Senators:

WARD of Penobscot
REID of Kennebec

Representative:

CASWELL of New Sharon

Comes from the House, the Minority Report accepted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "B" as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto, and as amended by House Amendment "A". (Amendment Filings, 409, 514, and 527)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the Minority Report was accepted in concurrence and the bill read once; Committee Amendment B was read and adopted.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the Senate voted to reconsider its action just taken whereby Committee Amendment B was adopted; House Amendment A to Committee Amendment B was read and adopted; Committee Amendment B as amended by House Amendment A was adopted; House Amendment A to the bill was read and adopted; and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence, as amended by Committee Amendment B as amended by House Amendment A thereto, and as further amended by House Amendment A.

The following Senators submitted their Final Reports:

Mr. Ward from the Committee on Labor.

Mrs. Kavanagh from the Committee on Public Health.

Mr. Harding from the Committee on Public Utilities.

Mr. Chase from the Committee on Taxation.

Mr. Haskell from the Committee on Transportation.

Which reports were severally read and accepted.

Sent down for concurrence

The Committee on Bills in the second reading reported the following Bill;

House, As Amended

Bill "An Act Relating to Pari Mutuel Pool Contributions and Night Racing." (H. P. 976) (L. D. 1064)

Which bill was read a second time.

Mr. Sinclair of Somerset; Mr. President, I move that the bill lie on the table and be especially assigned for Monday.

Mr. WEEKS of Cumberland: Mr. President, I move that when the vote is taken on the motion to table, it be taken by division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty having voted in the affirmative and nine opposed, the motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending passage to be engrossed.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Haskell of Penobscot was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, we have in our possession two legislative documents related to one another. One, I think is tabled in my name and relates to the State Police, Fish and Game, and Sea and Shore, being placed under the Personnel Board. It is a unanimous report of the committee and I have been told by the Chief of the State Police that it meets with his approval. I have been told by the Chief of Fish and Game that it meets with his approval and I have been told by the Sea and Shore Fisheries Chief that it meets with his approval.

I would like to do those things which will make an emergency measure out of it to avoid the confusion of granting wage increases to Personnel Board employees and having the statutory employees held up for the statutory 90 day period.

The related bill is the bill that sought to give wage retroactivity to July 1st of last year to the general fund employees with the inference in the bill that all employees would be given that treatment but which, of course, would not prevail with respect to the statutory employees, thereby creating that inequity.

The other Body approved a January 1st date. After debate in this Branch, in which I participated and stated that I did not believe that wage retroactivity should be established as a policy, this branch indefinitely postponed the measure and at last evenings session the Senator from Kennebec, Senator

Squire moved, and the Senate did vote, that we adhere.

This is not the time in this session, I think, for any display of stubbornness. I have not in any way relented on the general principles as to retroactivity. On the other hand, I see justice if the Senate is willing, that the wage increase provided for in the general fund appropriations measure as of the first day of July, will become effective as soon as may be after an emergency measure is enacted. The effect would be to say that the legislature instead of forcing upon the employees a July 1st date, is willing that they have that wage increase at the beginning of the second payroll period next following the date of the act.

A compelling reason for suggesting this to the Senate, is the type of leadership that the State Employees Association have. They came to me after my effort to defeat the retroactive measure and I thought they were pretty good sports in saying, "You are probably right on this, at least the principle can be debated and it might be that when we next seek wage changes, maybe we ought to acknowledge the justice of the retroactive objections, and ask for the increase on the day the measure has been signed."

I happen to have had quite a bit of experience with labor relations and I think that when the relationship reaches that stage, it is time for the employer to recognize the spirit and enter into it.

So the series of motions that I shall suggest, will I think, represent fairness and equity.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have become reconciled to the idea that we cannot give the bonus that I had hoped we might give to the employees. I appreciate the position the majority floor leader has taken this morning and I want to go along with him on this but I warn him that I am still coming back at some future date with my elderly teachers increase.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, I would ask if the Senate has in its possession L. D. 453.

The PRESIDENT: In answer to the inquiry, the Chair would state

that the bill is in the possession of the Senate.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby it voted to adhere on the previous action of indefinite postponement; the resolve was substituted for the Ought not to Pass report and read once; House Amendment A was read and indefinitely postponed and on motion by the same Senator, Resolve Appropriating Monies to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees H. P. 400, L. D. 453, was laid upon the table pending assignment for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Highways on bill, "An Act to Increase the Salaries of the State Police" (S. P. 295) (L. D. 829), report "Ought to pass in new draft and with New Title An Act Relating to Compensation of State Police and Wardens of Inland Fisheries and Game and Sea and Shore Fisheries Departments" (S. P. 603) (L. D. 1546) tabled by that Senator on May 1, pending parliamentary procedure; and on further motion by the same Senator, the report of the committee was accepted and the bill read once; Senate Amendment A was adopted without reading and under suspension of the rules, the bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment A. Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot,
Recessed for five minutes.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Additional House Paper, out of order and under suspension of the rules

Emergency Measure

Bill "An Act to Appropriate Monies for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes, for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955." (S. P. 587) (L. D. 1526)

Which bill being an emergency measure, and having received the affirmative vote of 28 members of the Senate, and none opposed, was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Resolve Appropriating Monies to Effectuate Salary Plan for State Employees, H. P. 400, L. D. 453, tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending assignment for second reading, and the same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, in support of the pending question which is the adoption of the amendment, I would explain that the adoption of this amendment will reduce whatever may be the estimated surplus at the end of this fiscal year by the sum of \$50,000. It will not in any way affect the operating gain for the next two years. I move the adoption of the amendment.

Which amendment the Resolve was adopted without reading and under suspension of the rules was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Joint Order recalling H. P. 830, L. D. 861, bill, An Act Relating to Definition of Employer Under Employment Security Law, from the legislative files to the Senate (S. P. 577) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, the reason that I recalled this bill was the fact that on April 16 when an ought not to pass report came into the Senate, I was either out or asleep. I had been informed by the members of the committee that there would be a divided report on this matter. Since this came out a unanimous report, I did not notice it and then when I found that the bill was in the files, I wanted to revive it. This Body went along with me, but the other Body refused permission to do so. Nevertheless, I feel that this

Body should be informed as to what I wanted to do.

I was approached two months ago concerning the dropping of compensation under the security law, from eight to four or less. I immediately took steps to find out if there was a similar bill and there was so I did not introduce any bill of my own, but the result, as you know, is that the bill has died and probably can't be revived until the next legislature.

A local contractor in Lewiston, who does a very small business, came to me and said he could not get employees because they all ask if he had unemployment compensation and he has to tell them no and so they refuse to work for him. I asked him why he didn't join up and he said he had tried to but couldn't. Finally I called the department up here in Augusta and I have here and would like to read to you an official reply which I received in answer to my request.

"Reference is made to your request for information relative to Mr. Bilodeau.

Please be advised that Mr. Bilodeau made application for voluntary election to become a subject employer under the Employment Security Law as of January 1, 1951. However, due to the fluctuation in his employment, his application was denied by the commission.

(Signed) L. C. Fortier, Chairman."

Now that was something I did not know. I thought anybody could come in if he wanted to, but apparently the Commission has the discretion to take them on or not as they see fit.

I have heard a lot about discrimination and if ever I saw discrimination, this is it. All I wanted to do under this law was to amend it so as to make it compulsory upon the Commission, that if a man wanted to join, he could. I say that this is discrimination against the small employer. I happen to be one of the border cases, some years I qualify and some I don't, but as I understand it, once you have been on, they cannot refuse you. I just wanted to amend the law so that anybody who wants to come in, can do so.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the Senate

voted to recede and concur with the House in the indefinite postponement of the order.

On motion by Mr. Collins of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to the Law of Manufacture and Sale of Bedding and Upholstered Furniture (H. P. 1275) (L. D. 1511) tabled by that Senator on May 1 pending passage to be enacted.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President, yesterday, I tabled this enactor because I was informed there was an \$8,000 price tag on it. I find that this is a bill that the committee on Public Health had at one time repealed, and the repealer was passed and signed by the Governor. Then the bill was reintroduced and the function under the bill was transferred from the Department of Health and Welfare to the Department of Labor where the Commissioner said they could handle the enforcement of the law. The fees that are collected under the terms of the bill probably amount to between \$3500 and \$4,000. If that is sufficient to carry out the enforcement of the act, why I certainly do not have any further objection to its enactment.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Divided House Reports from the Committee on Judiciary; Majority Report Ought not to pass; Minority Report Ought to Pass; on bill, An Act Relating to Political Party Representation on State Boards and Commissions (H. P. 1021) (L. D. 1140) tabled by that Senator on April 14 pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" was accepted, in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Divided House Reports from the Committee on Judiciary on bill, An Act Relating to Saturday Closing of Courthouse Offices (H. P. 966) (L. D. 1054) Majority Report Ought not to pass; Minority Report Ought to Pass; tabled by that Senator on April 14

pending consideration of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Majority "Ought not to pass" was accepted in concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. St. Pierre of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to Salary of Judge of the Lewiston Municipal Court (S. P. 336) (L. D. 841) tabled by that Senator on April 27 pending consideration; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to recede and concur with the House in the indefinite postponement of the bill.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to regulation of Cosmetics, tabled by that Senator on April 29 pending motion by Senator Kavanagh of Androscoggin, that the bill be re-committed to the Committee on Public Health.

On motion by Mrs. Kavanagh of Androscoggin, that Senator was granted leave to withdraw her motion to recommit, and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Collins of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill, An Act Amending the Election Laws, (S. P. 309) (L. D. 926) tabled by that Senator on April 9 pending passage to be enacted.

Mr. COLLINS of Aroostook: Mr. President, I move that, under suspension of the rules, the Senate reconsider its former action whereby this bill was passed to be engrossed.

The motion to reconsider engrossment prevailed.

Mr. COLLINS: Mr. President, I now present Senate Amendment A and move its adoption. I would say that this amendment strikes out that part of the bill which carried an appropriation of one thousand dollars, it being thought that the expenses could be taken from other sources when the occasion requires.

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was adopted without reading and

the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Hanson of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report "Ought to Pass" from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on bill, An Act Relating to Open Season on Muskrats in Washington County (H. P. 257) (L. D. 287) tabled by that Senator on April 21 pending consideration of the report.

Mr. Hanson of Washington: Mr. President, this is a bill that proposes to remove Washington County from spring muskrat trapping. Apparently this bill is sponsored by the department and aided and abetted by the Research Department of the University of Maine. I believe I know the status of muskrats in Washington County despite all the great research that has been done. We have plenty of muskrats in Washington County at the present time. The large majority of trappers, the wardens, and the people desire spring muskrating. I think from an economic point of view, it is greatly to the advantage of the people of Washington County to have spring muskrating. We have heard many arguments about conservation and interference with reproduction, but I believe the right thing for Washington County at the present time is to allow us to trap spring muskrats.

Mr. WIGHT of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this was a unanimous ought to pass report of the committee. It is a county measure to be sure, but there are various kinds of county measures. The Androscoggin County bill asked for Androscoggin County only and affected Androscoggin County only, but this bill affects the whole state. The wild life of the state knows no boundary between counties so that anything that happens in Washington County affects the entire state. I will grant you that we have many people in the County of Washington who favor spring trapping during the breeding season, but there are other trappers who believe the other way. I have a letter here from John Dudley of Calais who says:

"As proprietor of the marsh in Washington County in which there are alleged to be one thousand muskrat houses, I am very strongly in favor of fall trapping. It is because of my control of the water level that rats are abundant here. Kindly see that Washington County has fall trapping.

(Signed) John M. Dudley."

To be fair, I think we should give the arguments on both sides. The arguments in favor of spring trapping is that the days are warm and long and it is possible for a trapper to start in at four A. M. and then do his day's work and then in the afternoon, it is still light so he can trap again; whereas in the fall, he is busy guiding or hunting or trapping mink or has other duties. The other argument is that they are worth more per unit in the spring than in the fall. Those are the principal arguments, in favor of spring trapping.

In 1946 there were various sections in the state where these animals had been trapped or killed off because of the pressure of trapping. So the University of Maine investigated the situation and came up with a report which recommended fall trapping instead of spring, and that is allowing the animals to breed in the spring when there is plenty of food for them and then reap the harvest in the fall. There is a printed report on those findings and it states that one of the disadvantages of spring trapping is that the mink and the muskrat inhabit the same waters and nobody can trap muskrat in the spring where the mink are, without catching some of those mink.

This report was put out by Malcolm Coulter of the Maine Co-operative Wildlife Research Unit of the University of Maine and it says, "During the 1946 season, one mink was caught for every 67 muskrat." Now when we reduce that to the present situation in Washington County where there probably were five thousand muskrat taken this spring, if you figure one mink for every 67 muskrat you will find that 74 mink were killed in Washington County in this spring, and if 37 were females and each had six kittens, which is about the average, that is 222 mink and those would

have been worth \$22 each so you have an economic loss there that amounts to a great deal, and it affects the entire state because those mink travel up and down the brooks continuously and they don't confine their activities to one county.

There are also a large number of ducks killed in muskrat trapping in the spring. Those ducks are just ready to hatch, to lay their eggs and reproduce ducklings and it says in this report that during their investigation there was one duck caught to each eleven muskrat, a much larger amount than was supposed to be caught. If we figure on that with five thousand rats we come up with 450 ducks caught in muskrat trapping in Washington County and if you multiply that by five or six young ducklings and each one of them, 250, approximately, you come up with a pretty large number of ducks killed in Washington County this spring. The ducks get into the traps and it is impossible not to catch them whereas in the fall the ducks are not prevalent at that time.

In the spring the muskrats are fighting and a great many of the skins are damaged. I have some information regarding the revenue from muskrats. Twenty trappers have caught during three years of spring trapping, one thousand rats and those same twenty trappers in two years of fall trapping, caught 2,868 rats, almost three times as many in the fall as in the spring. When it comes to monetary value it gives in this report, the monetary value of spring trapping. The trappers made \$544.20 the first year of spring trapping, \$368 the next spring, \$280 the next spring, and in fall trapping, they made \$911 the first year, \$855 the next, and that is in the report from the University of Maine.

Many people like to night hunt or like to net fish but we have to have laws to stop them. That is just what this law does, it protects the muskrats in the spring so that they can breed and live and then the harvest is reaped in the fall. It also protects the mink, and the ducks.

Whatever happens in Washington County or any other county in the

State of Maine, either hurts or helps the rest of the state. We also pay an average of some \$233,000 to biologists in the state and if we are not going to go by what these biologists tell us, then we had better do away with the biologists.

I move the acceptance of the report.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in support of the Senator from Washington, Senator Hanson. I am no authority on wild life. I would not attempt to make any statement concerning the propagation of these animals. I do, however, rise to the principle of home rule. Two years ago there was brought into this legislature, a bill setting up spring trapping of muskrat in the County of Washington, I believe Cumberland and York. Apparently the sponsors of this measure fear the great and powerful delegation from the County of York because this legislation is aimed only at the county of Washington and they didn't mind picking on that county which was to be so seriously affected by reapportionment. Consequently the bill is brought out and aimed at Washington County. I believe the people of Washington County have good representation in this Senate. I firmly believe that that representative truly represents the people of that county and I think they know what is good for themselves and on the principle of home rule, and home rule alone, I ask you to support the Senator from Washington, Senator Hanson.

Mr. HANSON of Washington: Mr. President, I don't care to prolong this argument only I would like to answer one or two points brought up by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Wight. He said that the rats are allowed to have large families in the spring and they have an abundant food supply in the summer and can be trapped bounteously in the fall but he admits that we have no trappers to trap them in the fall, due to the economic necessities of our poor people in our County.

He admits that they don't care to fall trap because they have other things to do at that time of the year to help themselves earn a living and he wants to deny them this

chance to supplement their living, when we have a lot of rats to trap. If it ever comes to where we don't have muskrats in the spring then I will be glad to go along with Senator Wight of Penobscot.

Mr. BROGGI of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, unlike my colleague, Senator Dennett, I am an authority on muskrats. There are now just two counties left in the state that have spring trapping and I am fearful that if the little County of Washington loses its trapping rights, that the County of York will be next on the list. This does involve home rule. It has never been definitely proven that fall trapping is a conservation measure. Spring trappers who have trapped for twenty-five years have told me they have never found young in the bodies of muskrats.

This is a question of which came first, the hen or the egg. Naturally the muskrat trapped in the fall does not live to bear young in the spring and by the same token, the muskrats trapped in the spring could not live to have a litter in the summer. Good fall trapping means a muskrat catch of several times the spring catch and is that a conservation measure? Muskrat pelts will produce muskrat coats and Maine muskrat pelts are among the best in the world. That is a matter of record. The spring pelt is a good pelt, and is called a prime pelt and worth 15% more than the fall pelt, which is not a prime pelt. Asking the state to be put entirely on fall trapping indicates a desire not to have any prime pelts.

York and Washington Counties now are the only counties in Maine producing prime pelts. I am most heartily in accord with the Senator from Washington, Senator Hanson, and certainly hope that his motion prevails.

Mr. SQUIRE of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I came down here and certainly did not expect to get into a discussion about muskrats but I would like to say this. Everyone has a personal interest probably, in each bill that comes to the legislature. I happen to be in the retail fur business and I want to go along

with Senator Hanson and Senator Broggi in his remarks about the producing of prime pelts in the State of Maine. The spring pelts are much more valuable and we would like to see more Maine pelts on the market. I don't know about the entire state but as I understand it, York and Cumberland and Washington counties where spring trapping is allowed, I don't think we should deny that because I do think there should be an effort on the part of the State of Maine to produce better pelts.

I do a slow burn, really when I go to the fur market and find that in order to get a good pelt, a good prime pelt, I have to buy a New York pelt. I think that we in Maine should make an effort to produce the better pelts. For this reason I shall go along with the Senator from Washington, Senator Hanson.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Wight, that the Senate accept the ought to pass report of the committee.

A viva voce vote being had,

The motion did not prevail and the Senate failed to accept the ought to pass report.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Divided House Reports from the Committee on Judiciary on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for a Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and the Korean Campaign (H. P. 1133) (L. D. 1283) Majority Report "Ought to Pass"; Minority Report "Ought not to pass" tabled by that Senator on April 28 pending motion by Senator Ward of Penobscot, that the Senate accept the ought to pass report.

Mr. REID of Kennebec: Mr. President, I move the pending question and I would say that I think there is a very substantial percentage of veterans in the state who want a bonus, and think that they are entitled to it.

I am not going to debate that issue. The only reason I voted for this was so that it could go to the people to decide once and for all, without any specific tax attached

to it, so that the veterans could say the people were voting against the tax.

Mr. HASKELL of Penobscot: Mr. President, my remarks will be equally brief. I oppose the motion to accept the ought to pass report for one simple reason. The people have had an opportunity to vote on this issue. They did defeat it 109,450 to 60,544. This vote did involve payments. If twenty million dollar bond issue is passed, it must by some means or another, be financed by tax payments. Those are my only arguments against the bonus and I am sure that the people, realizing that the bonus must be paid for would again vote the same way.

Mr. DENNETT of York: Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. I assure you I shall be equally brief. I speak as a veteran who wants no share in the bonus if it should be granted. There are many veterans who believe that when this first was submitted to the people with the tax attached, that the veterans received a raw deal. I would like it again to go to the people so that they all would realize that they had had a square deal.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President, I too, want to go along with Senator Reid of Kennebec and submit this to the people. I was most viciously opposed to the previous offer made to the veterans. In some cases I was taken to task by the veterans and I took time to tell them the whole story and invariably the veteran would reconcile himself to the fact that he would have to pay more in the next ten years for the bonus than he would receive from it under that bill.

Now, I want to see this go to the people. Let them decide once and for all whether they want a bonus and are willing to pay for it. I hope that the motion will prevail because I want to see what will happen to the bill when the question is sent to the people without a tax attached to it.

Mr. SQUIRE: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Ward, that the Senate ac-

cept the Majority Report "Ought to Pass".

A division of the Senate was had. Fifteen having voted in the affirmative the ten opposed, the motion prevailed, the majority report "Ought to Pass" was accepted and under suspension of the rules, the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Divided House Reports from the Committee on Judiciary; Majority Report Ought to Pass as amended by Committee Amendment A; Minority Report "Ought not to pass" on bill, An Act to Authorize Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Twenty Million Dollars for Bonus to Maine Veterans of World War II and Korean Campaign (H. P. 1132) (L. D. 1282) tabled by the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Ward on April 28 pending consideration of the reports.

On motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the ought to pass report was accepted, Committee Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Divided House Reports from the Committee on Judiciary; Majority Report Ought to Pass; Minority Report Ought Not to Pass; on bill, An Act Relating to Evidence of Intoxication (H. P. 422) (L. D. 469) tabled by that Senator on April 1 pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the "Ought Not to Pass" report was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Collins of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to certain Tax Exemptions for Amputee Veterans (S. P. 55) (L. D. 83), tabled by that Senator on March 12th pending passage to be enacted, and that Senator yielded to the Senator from York, Senator Broggi.

On motion by Mr. Broggi of York, under suspension of the rules, the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby Committee Amendment A was adopted.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment A to Committee Amendment A, which was adopted.

Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto was adopted and the bill as amended by Committee Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A thereto, was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Chapman of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Permitting Reassignment of Justice in Equity Matters (S. P. 484) (L. D. 1342), tabled by that Senator on April 24th pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

The same Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Ward of Penobscot, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Chapman, to adopt Senate Amendment A, and was especially assigned for tomorrow.

On motion by Mr. Chapman of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to Admission Age for Maine School for Deaf (S. P. 418) (L. D. 1126), tabled by that Senator on April 29th pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator the bill was passed to be enacted.

The PRESIDENT: At this time, the Chair would like to make on the record, a statement which could well be made off the record. I don't know how many of the Senators are aware of it, but there is a considerable amount of gossip up and

down the corridors of this building with reference to the fact that the majority party floor leader of this Senate is driving unnecessarily toward adjournment.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding whatever about this matter, I wish to say publicly that in all of these decisions, the floor leader has taken part, your presiding officer has taken part, and on some occasions the Governor has taken part and I wish to make it perfectly plain that so far as I am concerned I resent very much the fact that any blame is being attributed to any individual Senator.

I wish the Senate to know by the same token, that I want to share any blame because the only desire that I have had and I am sure your majority floor leader has had is that this session may proceed in an orderly manner so that we might get through our business and get home. I am sure that both of us felt at the start of this current week that unless an honest effort were made along those lines, that we would be unable to complete our work and adjourn even next week.

I wish you all to know that as far as I am concerned, I want to take my share in the responsibilities of any of these decisions and I also want you to know that I am standing behind Bob Haskell one hundred percent.

Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as far as I am concerned

at least, I am more than satisfied with the way that the Senate has operated all through this session. I say and honestly believe that we have had an orderly session and have not been pushed by anyone. The Majority Floor Leader has been more than fair and the President of the Senate has been more than fair in all respects. Both of them have leaned over backwards to try to be fair and just and pleasant and I want to put that on the record because that is exactly how I feel. I have not been treated more fairly in all the twenty years I have been here.

Mr. Butler of Franklin was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, despite any unfavorable reports that one may hear, one also hears good reports and the good reports sometimes do not reach our ears as quickly as the unfavorable reports do.

The good reports that we have heard in the halls of this building in regard to our majority floor leader, are that at no time for many years has there been such a conscientious, hardworking, fair-playing floor leader in all instances, regardless of what has happened in the past, than has been exemplified this year by Bob Haskell, our majority floor leader.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Haskell of Penobscot,

Adjourned until Monday morning May 4, 1953 at nine o'clock eastern standard time.