

# 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 Third  
Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1967

KENNEBEC JOURNAL  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

**HOUSE**

Friday, April 28, 1967

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

Prayer by Brigadier Alfred Davey of the Salvation Army in Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

**Papers from the Senate**

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Authorizing Joint Rates Between Certain Transportation Carriers" (S. P. 609) (L. D. 1603)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Public Utilities.

In the House:

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens.

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, I move that this be tabled until the next legislative day.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, moves that item one be tabled until Tuesday, May 2, pending reference in concurrence.

Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor requested a vote on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson requests a division on the tabling motion. All those in favor of tabling will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

44 having voted in the affirmative and 54 having voted in the negative, the motion to table did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Bill was referred to the Committee on Public Utilities in concurrence.

**Senate Reports of Committees Ought Not to Pass**

Report of the Committee on Education reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize Bond Issue in the Amount of \$500,000 for a Reserve Fund to Guarantee Student Loans under

the Higher Education Act of 1965" (S. P. 72) (L. D. 154)

Report of the Committee on Public Utilities reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to Permits and Hearings in Regulation of Contract Carriers" (S. P. 355) (L. D. 939)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Reports were read and accepted in concurrence.

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act relating to School Entrance Age Requirements" (S. P. 213) (L. D. 476) on which the House on April 25 voted to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendments "A" and "B" in non-concurrence.

Came from the Senate with that body voting to insist on its former action whereby the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence and asking for a Committee of Conference, with the following Conferees appointed on its part:

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln  
Messrs. ALBAIR of Arrostook  
GOOD of Cumberland

In the House: On motion of Mrs. Hanson of Lebanon, the House voted to further insist on its former action and join in the Committee of Conference.

The following Communication:

THE SENATE OF MAINE  
AUGUSTA, MAINE

April 27, 1967

Bertha W. Johnson  
Clerk of the House  
103rd Legislature

Madam:

The President of the Senate today appointed the following members of the Senate to the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing action of the two branches of the Legislature on:

Bill "An Act Increasing Compensation of Members of the Legislature" (S. P. 167) (L. D. 338)

Senators:

KATZ of Kennebec  
MacLEOD of Penobscot  
SNOW of Cumberland

Respectfully,

(Signed) JERROLD B. SPEERS  
Secretary of the Senate

The Communication was read and ordered placed on file.

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Tuesday, May 2, at ten o'clock in the morning. (S. P. 615)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

In the House, the Order was read and passed in concurrence.

#### Orders

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if L. D. 1350 is in the possession of the House.

The SPEAKER: The answer is in the affirmative.

Mrs. HANSON: I would like to reconsider and speak briefly to my motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson, moves that the House reconsider its action of yesterday whereby it receded and concurred with the Senate on Bill "An Act relating to Unity Institute," House Paper 934, L. D. 1350. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed.

Mrs. HANSON: I would like to reconsider our action of yesterday in order that we could—the Committee feels that these two colleges, Unity and John Kennedy, simply have not conformed with the State law. This is not a decision made by the Committee or by the State Board of Education, the Department of Education or individually. It is simply that there is a State law that these schools must conform to a certain pattern before they can be affirmed as colleges. It would not be fair to give these two colleges this privilege—because these institutions,

because if we did, it would open the door to every small college in the State. For instance, Unity only has at the present time, I think it's six pupils and three teachers. You can't call that a college. I don't mean Unity, I mean John F. Kennedy. Unity has 54. I believe that Unity in two years will probably come up to the standards that they are asked to come up to and one of the standards is that they must be an institution for two years. Therefore, simply as a matter of conforming to the law, I think we should definitely postpone this bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will advise the gentlewoman that this is a non-concurrent matter and the motions of privilege are recede, concur, insist and adhere.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary question — what is the motion that we're considering now?

The SPEAKER: We're considering receding and concurring. That is the pending question.

Mr. SUSI: Well, I hope that we do get support for receding and concurring. I apologize that this little bill has taken so much of our time when we have so many serious things to consider, and there are two other schools concerned. It appears to me that John F. Kennedy and Unity Institute are destined to share if they stay together during this session of Legislature. Like Nelson Eddy and Jeannette MacDonald, they see to have become inseparable. Various attempts were made in the movies in respect to star these people separately but invariably the next time around is Nelson Eddy and Jeannette MacDonald singing their Indian love song. So with Unity Institute and John F. Kennedy.

There has been no evidence given that the intent or the effort of either of these schools has been misguided and one may have had greater resources to start it with but there has been different results to date, but no bad intentions have been indicated. I think that particularly the older hands in this Legislature realize that when you get to monkeying around

with a bill the way this one has been monkeyed around with, all of a sudden the bill is apt to disappear. Now it has concerned me considerably how to act responsibly in this situation because I share concern with many on it. And thinking about it I was reminded of an experience that I had some twenty-five years ago while I was in the Navy and I was based at San Francisco Bay and I was eating my lunch, sitting within a few feet of a great high pyramid of concrete blocks. Each block was around eight feet square and about four feet deep and weighed several tons. And my iron pail was on top of it and while I was eating my lunch this young colored fellow—we had just had a large shipment of negro recruits shipped to the Base, walked along there and stood looking at this great heap of concrete blocks and scratching his head and obviously wondering what they were. And an officer came along and this young negro recruit said, "Excuse me, sir, can you tell me what them things are?" And the officer said, "Well we call those clumps. We use them for anchoring the submarine torpedo net across San Francisco Bay." And the recruit thanked him very much and in just a moment along comes a very little insignificant looking negro recruit and the one who had just got his new information said, "Hey, boy, do you know what them is?" And the little fellow says, "You mean them concrete blocks?" And the first one said, "Do you mean to tell me that you have been in the Navy all this time and you don't know that them's clumps?"

Well, I think it would be unbecoming for either of these schools to flaunt its new found eminence which is directly a result of the support you have given it in its votes in pointing out any particular differences that exist. Right now one may be a few steps ahead of the other but tomorrow the other may be a mile ahead of the first.

I hope that you vote to recede and concur this morning and get on to more serious business, and allow us to use the word "college." Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to point out one thing that was revealed to me this morning upon a call to the Department of Education. I have absolutely no objection to Unity using the word "college" and I have no objection to John F. Kennedy College being called "college" until I found out this morning that they have one full-time instructor at the John F. Kennedy College, three part-time instructors, six full-time students, and maybe as many as ten students that come to a night art course; and because of this I don't think they've earned the right yet to this name. I think perhaps they will and hope they will, but I don't think they have, and I hope that we would defeat this motion to recede and concur so that someone could make a motion to insist and form a Committee of Conference and work it out with the Senate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Mrs. Hanson.

Mrs. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I must confess that my parliamentary law confuses me. I meant to ask to insist.

The SPEAKER: Receding and concurring has priority over insist. If receding and concurring fails, then a motion to insist would be in order. Is the House ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pittsfield, Mr. Susi.

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We're political beings or we wouldn't be here and I would like to call to your attention that the name of the school that we're talking of this morning is John F. Kennedy Institute. Now if it were John Q. Smith Institute, I think it might be a different thing. But I think this has political implications and I would like to offer a political opinion. That should we defeat this motion to recede and concur and that this go into a Committee of Conference, this bill is just as

dead as a clam, and I hope that you support the recede and concur motion.

Mr. Richardson of Stonington then requested a vote on the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoïn.

Mr. BOURGOÏN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Of course I haven't been back to Fort Kent for the last five weeks, but the last I knew of there were four professors for thirteen students, and those four professors all had BA's, advanced college degrees. I wish to thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I dislike to disagree with my worthy colleague from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoïn, but the director of the school the day that he appeared before the Education Committee pointed out that one half of the instructors had Masters Degrees and the other half had Bachelor of Arts Degrees, and when we asked him how many instructors there were he said four. So only two have their Masters Degree and there are no Doctorates on the staff at all. Unity does have three Doctorates and seven Masters Degrees, and only three of their faculty do not have advanced degrees.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I might suggest that we passed a similar bill for another school in another area of the state but Fort Kent, and that school does not have one person who has a Bachelor's Degree.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion to recede and concur. All those in favor of receding and concurring will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 90 having voted in the affirmative and 34 having voted in the

negative, the motion to recede and concur did prevail.

#### House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mr. Harriman from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to Optional Provisions in Individual Accident and Health Insurance Policies" (H. P. 210) (L. D. 300) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Same gentlemen from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Repealing Exemptions under Itinerant Vendor Law" (H. P. 962) (L. D. 1405)

Mr. Trask from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Solicitation by Crematoriums of Prearranged Cremations" (H. P. 1057) (L. D. 1530)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Birt from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Appropriating Moneys for Construction of a Reception Diagnostic Treatment Center for Persons Committed to any Penal Institution" (H. P. 460) (L. D. 673)

Mr. Scott of Wilton from the Committee on Business Legislation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Definition of Securities" (H. P. 733) (L. D. 1056)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### Tabled and Assigned

Mr. Sullivan from the Committee on Business Legislation reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Counter-signing Fees for Insurance Agents and Brokers" (H. P. 875) (L. D. 1287)

Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Scott of Wilton, tabled pending acceptance and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 2.)

Mr. Harvey from the Committee on Claims reported "Ought not to pass" on Resolve in favor of Seth A. Whitcomb of Readfield for In-

juries Sustained While State Employee (H. P. 782) (L. D. 1144)

Mr. Snowe from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Use of Town Highway Equipment on Private Ways" (H. P. 1044) (L. D. 1516)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### **Covered by Other Legislation**

Mr. Gauthier from the Committee on Business Legislation on Bill "An Act relating to the Practice of Public Accountancy" (H. P. 302) (L. D. 486) reported "Ought not to pass", as covered by other legislation.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

#### **Ought to Pass in New Draft New Drafts Printed**

Mrs. Lincoln from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act relating to Furnishing of Service by Public Utilities" (H. P. 537) (L. D. 766) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1130) (L. D. 1606) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mrs. Kilroy from the Committee on Transportation on Bill "An Act relating to Weight and Weight Tolerance of Vehicles Loaded with Minerals" (H. P. 79) (L. D. 1704) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1132) (L. D. 1608) under title of "An Act relating to Weight and Weight Tolerance of Vehicles" and that it "Ought to pass"

Reports were read and accepted, the New Drafts read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

#### **Ought to Pass Printed Bills**

Mr. Birt from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Authorizing Construction of a Ferry Boat for the Maine State Ferry Service (H. P. 465) (L. D. 678)

Mr. Scott of Presque Isle from the Committee on Business Legislation reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Banks Participating in Public Agencies" (H. P. 961) (L. D. 1404)

Mr. Minkowsky from the Committee on Claims reported same on Resolve in favor of Paul V. Douglass of Winslow for Well Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 402) (L. D. 568)

Mr. Meisner from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation for Full-time Deputy Sheriffs and Chief Deputies" (H. P. 950) (L. D. 1381)

Mr. Nadeau from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Duties of Deputy County Treasurer" (H. P. 334) (L. D. 468)

Mr. Robertson from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Annual Postaudit for Municipalities" (H. P. 166) (L. D. 229)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice, Resolves read once, and tomorrow assigned.

#### **Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment**

Mrs. Baker from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Creating the Town of Old Orchard Beach School District" (H. P. 1082) (L. D. 1547) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A", being L. D. 1609, was read by the Clerk and adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Williams from the Committee on Public Utilities on Bill "An Act to Enable City of Portland to Establish Sewer Service Charges" (H. P. 946) (L. D. 1377) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H.P. 946, L.D. 1377, Bill, "An Act to Enable City of Portland to Establish Sewer Service Charges."

Amend said Bill by inserting at the end of the first sentence, before

the period, of subsection 2 of that part designated "Sec. 10," of section 1 (same in L.D. 1377) the following:

**'or for the construction of a revenue-producing municipal facility'**

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of the 2nd paragraph of that part designated "Sec. 11," of section 1 and inserting in place thereof the following:

**'In the event it is determined to compute such charges on the basis of the quantity of water used, the Portland Water District shall provide to the city water consumption records for premises indicated by the city and served by the district for periods agreed upon by the district and the city. The city shall pay to the Portland Water District therefor all of its cost and expense in furnishing such data. The Portland Water District shall have no liability to any person, firm or corporation for releasing to the city any information or data requested of it by the city.'**

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

#### **Divided Report Tabled and Assigned**

Majority Report of the Committee on Agriculture reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Create a State-wide Milk Marketing and Producer Pool" (H. P. 569) (L. D. 801)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BARNES of Aroostook  
CURTIS of Penobscot  
GIRARD of Androscoggin  
—of the Senate.

Messrs. JEWELL of Monticello  
BRADSTREET of Newport  
EVANS of Freedom  
HALL of Windham  
MOSHER of Gorham  
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1131) (L. D. 1607) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following member:

Mr. HANSON of Solon  
—of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: This bill L. D. 801 is of significant importance to the dairy industry in the state. I think probably most of you are aware that roughly half, slightly less than half of the producers in Maine ship on the Boston market and therefore do not share in the Maine market, and the Maine market is a preferred market. The average price received on the Maine market is about eighty-one cents a hundred weight more than on the Boston market.

This bill was submitted with the okay of the Attorney General's Office in a rough form, so that it could be discussed in committee hearing and then additions and corrections could be made so that it would be workable and Constitutional. Now this has been done. A great deal of effort has gone into this bill. The new draft, as I have reported out "ought to pass," has been approved by the Attorney General's Office as being Constitutional and it's been approved by the Maine Milk Commission as something that they could in fact administer. It's a rather involved situation and I think that the members of this House should have an opportunity to have time to study the redraft.

Now it isn't currently available; it will be shortly. Because of this I would make a motion that we accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report and I would hope that this matter might be tabled until Wednesday next. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Solon, Mr. Hanson, now moves that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report in new draft.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Allen of Caribou, the Reports and Bill were tabled pending the motion of Mr. Hanson of Solon to accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 3.



### Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Increasing Borrowing Power of Maine Maritime Academy" (H. P. 128) (L. D. 192)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BERRY of Cumberland  
ALBAIR of Aroostook  
DUQUETTE of York  
—of the Senate.

Messrs. BRAGDON of Perham  
BIRT of East Millinocket  
DUNN of Denmark  
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HUMPHREY of Augusta  
HINDS of South Portland  
JALBERT of Lewiston  
SCRIBNER of Portland  
—of the House.

Reports were read.

(On motion of Mr. Richardson of Stonington, tabled pending acceptance of either Report and special-ly assigned for Wednesday, May 3.)

### Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act relating to Number of Officers of Associated Hospital Service of Maine" (S. P. 549) (L. D. 1395)

Bill "An Act to Allocate Moneys for the Administrative Expenses of the State Liquor Commission for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1968 and June 30, 1969" (H. P. 82) (L. D. 112)

Bill "An Act Repealing Trade-in Credit for Motor Vehicles Under Sales Tax Law" (H. P. 121) (L. D. 147)

Bill "An Act Reactivating the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth" (H. P. 261) (L. D. 382)

Bill "An Act relating to Taxation of Television Sets" (H. P. 287) (L. D. 407)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

### Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act relating to Membership on the Maine Milk Commission" (H. P. 339) (L. D. 487)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

(On motion of Mr. Hawes of Union, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 4.)

Bill "An Act Clarifying Compensation for Disfigurement Under the Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 608) (L. D. 852)

Bill "An Act Providing Funds for a Redevelopment Plan of the Portland and South Portland Waterfront" (H. P. 657) (L. D. 912)

Bill "An Act Increasing Tax on Milk Producers for Promotional Purposes" (H. P. 775) (L. D. 1137)

Bill "An Act to Increase Borrowing Capacity of the Fort Fairfield Utilities District" (H. P. 806) (L. D. 1182)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

### Third Reader Amended

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Classroom Building at Erskine Academy" (H. P. 930) (L. D. 1346)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I feel that I should explain briefly that inadvertently you had two of these amendments passed to you on your desks this morning, only due to the sequence of the filing numbers. I now offer House Amendment "B" under filing number 226 and move its adoption.

Thereupon, House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to H. P. 930, L. D. 1346, Bill, "An Act Appropriating Funds for Classroom Building at Erskine Academy."

Amend said Bill in the first line (2nd line in L. D. 1346) by striking out the figure "\$75,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure '\$25,000'

House Amendment "B" was adopted, the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended and sent to the Senate.

Bill "An Act relating to Taxation of Buildings on Leased Land in Unorganized Territory" (H. P. 1129) (L. D. 1602)

Resolve Authorizing the Sale of State Land Located at Thomaston (S. P. 357) (L. D. 941)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bill read the third time. Resolve read the second time, both passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate.

#### Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to the Practice of Hairdressing and Beauty Culture" (H. P. 348) (L. D. 496)

Bill "An Act to Validate Proceedings Authorizing the Issuance of Bonds or Notes by School Administrative District No. 57" (H. P. 574) (L. D. 807)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, read the third time, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

#### Third Reader

##### Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Clarifying Compensation for Occupational Disease Under Workmen's Compensation Act" (H. P. 650) (L. D. 903)

Was reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading and read the third time.

(On motion of Mr. McMann of Bath, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Wednesday, May 3.)

Bill "An Act relating to Workmen's Compensation Insurance" (H. P. 754) (L. D. 1101)

Resolve Authorizing the Disposal of Northern Maine Sanatorium (S. P. 239) (L. D. 564)

Resolve to Authorize a Professional Review and Analysis of Maine's World Trade Potential (H. P. 495) (L. D. 708)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bill read the third time, Resolves read the second time, all passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

#### Passed to Be Enacted

An Act relating to School Building Remodeling (S. P. 61) (L. D. 74)

An Act relating to Enforcement Duties of Inland Fish and Game Wardens (S. P. 245) (L. D. 605)

An Act relating to Line Budgets for All Counties (S. P. 567) (L. D. 1437)

An Act Increasing Payments to County Law Libraries (S. P. 606) (L. D. 1588)

An Act relating to Payment of Fees to Secretary of State Resulting in Protest (H. P. 167) (L. D. 230)

An Act relating to Definition of Sporting Camp Under Fish and Game Laws (H. P. 359) (L. D. 506)

An Act relating to the Hunting of Muskrat, Mink, Otter and Fisher by Indians (H. P. 670) (L. D. 942)

An Act Providing Relocation Assistance by Municipalities (H. P. 729) (L. D. 1053)

An Act Amending the Charter of the Town of Falmouth (H. P. 760) (L. D. 1107)

An Act Permitting Northern Maine General Hospital of Eagle Lake to Maintain Medical or Social Care Institution (H. P. 889) (L. D. 1303)

#### Finally Passed

Resolve Permitting Augusta Golf Company to Draw Water from Lake Cobbosseecontee (S. P. 232) (L. D. 557)

Resolve Regulating Fishing on Part of Moose River, Somerset County (S. P. 604) (L. D. 1587)

Resolve Increasing Retirement Benefit of Charles S. Hulbert of Shin Pond (H. P. 914) (L. D. 1323)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly

and strictly engrossed, Bills passed to be enacted, Resolves finally passed, all signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

#### Orders of the Day

The Chair laid before the House the first item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on State Government on Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Relating to Disqualification of Legislators for Crimes. (H. P. 615) (L. D. 857)

Tabled—April 18, by Mr. Hennessey of West Bath.

Pending—Acceptance.

On motion of Mr. Hennessey of West Bath, the "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the second item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act relating to Education of Members of Lewiston Police Department" (H. P. 207) (L. D. 298)

Tabled—April 19, by Mr. Cote of Lewiston.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, the Bill was passed to be engrossed and sent to the Senate (Later reconsidered and tabled).

The Chair laid before the House the third item of Unfinished Business:

An Act Creating a Capitol Planning Commission (S. P. 520) (L. D. 1340)

Tabled—April 20, by Mr. Birt of East Millinocket.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Friday, May 5.

The Chair laid before the House the fourth item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE REPORT — Ought to Pass—Committee on Indian Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Compensation and Allowances for Mem-

bers of the Indian Tribes at the Legislature" (H. P. 89) (L. D. 186)

Tabled—April 20, by Mr. Levesque of Madawaska.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland to Indefinitely Postpone Report and Bill.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: L.D. 186 relating to compensation and allowances for members of the Indian tribes at the Legislature, should not be indefinitely postponed.

I oppose the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson. This bill came out of the Indian Affairs Committee with an "Ought to pass" Report, and I will explain the "Ought to pass" Report.

Nine members of the Committee signed out this Report, "Ought to pass." The one member who was not contacted was the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, so I was charged with the duty of finding Mr. Dennett and asking him how he wanted to sign the bill. I never did find out how he wanted to sign the bill, except that later on he tabled the bill. The bill has been tabled many times since that.

Now I feel that it is necessary that we pass bills, and not legislative orders. A bill and not a legislative order is necessary to assure future representatives of the Indian tribes compensation and allowances and mileage in order that they may adequately represent their tribes.

The Republican Platform includes the following suggestion: We urge that the Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes be given the necessary governmental and economic assistance to enable them to have a choice and a voice as to their future role in our society.

The Democratic Platform includes increased financial assistance for attendance at the Legislature, and a voice on the Floor of the House.

If L. D. 186 is killed, the white man will once again break faith with his Indian brother. The Mem-

bers of the 103rd Legislature should not let this happen.

Would you like to go home with \$25.00 a week? Well, the Indian representatives are getting \$500, and they have come to the Legislature many times on a false alarm, only to find out that their bill has been tabled and retabled. I say that ten trips will not allow them to adequately represent their tribes and explain what their problems are.

I doubt if any lobbyist gets \$500 for lobbying for fourteen bills or more—I think the Indians have probably eighteen or twenty bills that they have to lobby on—I'd like to see any lobbyist come down here and lobby this number of bills with this amount of pay, and no room or food allowance and so forth. I mean they really are expected to be master minds I guess.

I have an amendment to the bill that I would present to give them \$1,000. However, I hate to cut it down, but in order to save the bill I would present the amendment and make it \$1,000. Now, I have letters from the Indian Governors saying that they are opposed to the indefinite postponement of this bill. I have support of His Excellency, Governor Curtis, favoring a pay raise for the Indians. Commissioner Hinckley favors this, and Representative Cookson who is not here today, told me he would speak in favor of this bill. So I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, to indefinitely postpone this bill does not prevail, and I do hope that we do consider that we did set up the Indian Affairs Committee and with some of this money perhaps we could have paid the Indians who come down here to lobby. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Neither emotionalism nor political expediency should make us adopt a program or a course of action with respect to any L. D., and it is for that reason that I want to discuss this again with you very briefly.

As you know the Legislature in 1953, I believe, passed a Resolve proposing an amendment to the Constitution which was later adopted by the people providing full voting privileges to all Indians. This bill was opposed during that session on the grounds that there was some fear among the Indians that as a consequence of being given the unqualified right to vote they would become subject to taxation. For some reason unknown to me, and to most of us, Indians have not been voting in their elections for members of this House. We intend to correct that oversight—the Secretary of State has assured us that ballots forwarded will include Indian Reservations in Princeton, Perry and Old Town, and we have passed an order in this House directing the special Select Committee on Senate Reapportionment to report a bill to us which will include those three reservations within House voting distance. So that the right of the Indian to vote is being guaranteed and we are taking the necessary steps to see that he does have an opportunity to vote in elections for membership in this body.

Now, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Hinckley and I have discussed this matter on several occasions, and he points out that historically Indian tribes have been hesitant about voting in general elections because they felt that perhaps by so doing they might surrender some of their integrity. But the history has been that when these Indian tribes have gotten active in politics they've become very effective politically and that now they recognize the wisdom of a choice which they may have reluctantly made earlier or even opposed.

Today we are confronted by the same problem.

Now the question of tribal representation to the Legislature is what is troubling the Representative from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

I had a meeting with all of the Tribal Governors and all of the Tribal Representatives—or lobbyists as you call them, or you might call them, here, and there

were questions certainly, and concern certainly, but I've received no letter from any of these Governors and I wrote to each of them on April 5, 1967, and I made the following statement:

"Because we are most anxious that there be no misunderstanding of the effect that this action will have on tribal representatives at the Legislature, we at this time want to assure you that it is our intention that tribal representation continue, even though Indians will be voting in general elections. Tribal representation at the Legislature will continue to be at State expense under such allowances as each session of the Legislature grants. The Republican leadership does not intend any reduction in the statutory allowances granted at previous sessions. Of course you realize that my statements are those of the present leadership. It should not be understood by you as a guarantee that there will never be any change in the law."

Now, we discussed this. I feel that these Indian tribes are being given a right to vote in general elections. I think we're bending over backwards by continuing to provide tribal representatives which we've described as a species of municipal lobbyist—when the State is still picking up the tab. In effect they're securing double representation here and I for one am all in favor of it.

The question now is, shall we go beyond the \$500 that we're paying them? The tribal representatives to the Legislature are getting \$500, they're getting postage allowances, telephone credit cards, and ten round trips. The Republican leadership intends no reduction in that allowance to the tribal representatives, but we do say that under these circumstances it is unwise to grant an additional salary increase to these tribal representatives.

The amount involved is small—I would be the first to admit that, but I believe that what we're doing is right, I don't think that we need to apologize to any special interest group or to any group which says that it has the best interests of the Indians at heart.

I think we're perfectly justified in exercising what we think is good judgment, and in making this decision. The Committee's report came out before this Constitutional problem was discussed or known about, and therefore I don't think that we're overriding the report of this Committee. I know that many members of the Committee support the action which I have suggested that we take.

Now I regret very much if there is any suggestion that the Republican Party has by doing this wretched, if you will, on some statement made on the Republican Platform. I believe if you will read the platform you'll find that we're doing exactly what we have said we would do, and we're doing everything to give them full governmental participation privileges.

I won't read to you the extensive Democratic Platform procedure because I don't think it would be particularly instructive.

I hope that all of you will vote in favor of the indefinite postponement of this and not be swayed by any pressure group which as I say, says that it has the best interests of the Indians at heart. When the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, I would request a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill which I co-sponsored with Representative Scott, simply guarantees in the statute law what has been granted by a House Order in this session. The amendment that Mrs. Carswell is speaking about would cut the full compensation to \$1,000. This probably would not be quite adequate but it would guarantee at least in the statute law that the Indian representatives would be adequately compensated.

We can have no guarantee unless this is done because the next Legislature might decide not to grant the privileges that this one has been generous enough to do.

I don't think this is asking too much. In fact, as you know, there

is another bill also co-sponsored by myself and Mr. Scott that would have granted them seating privileges and speaking privileges, but no vote.

The question has arisen about representation—double representation, or whether some people are adequately or inadequately represented. Now, the basis to some extent of the bill to give the Indians seating privileges, was on the basis of the territorial delegates to the United States Congress. Each territory has historically been guaranteed one representative regardless of population. Now theoretically the present Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico could say that there should be five of him in Congress because he represents approximately two and a half million people. This is neither here nor there.

The Indian tribes, when the white men came here were, and were treated as such, as sovereign nations. Gradually their rights, their privileges, their powers were taken away from them in one way or another either directly or indirectly by all sorts of methods. And now I think that most of us are hoping that they shall be given, and should have, the privileges of every other person. But some are worried about double representation.

I think surely, I myself, if it should chance that the Penobscot Reservation would be integrated into my House district, that I should do everything in my power to represent those people as I do the other residents of my district, and I am sure that probably every other Representative in this House should the same thing happen to him, would do likewise.

But there are some people who would not. There are some people in the future who would not. There are some people who have ingrained prejudices against the Indians. Whether this is right, or whether it is not right does not enter into the picture at all. The Indian tribes themselves would like to have a man of their own tribe, or a woman as the case might be, down here to see to their interests. Historically they

have been granted this privilege, since the year 1823; this is the oldest record we have on it. I believe there are records, if we could find them, that would show that this existed even when we were a part of Massachusetts.

This bill that we are considering today changes nothing in the present system of representation, but to guarantee that the Indian should have instead of five hundred dollars for a session, he should have a thousand; that he should get his five dollars a day for meals; that he should get his seven dollars a day—up to seven dollars a day for the days that he is here, for his room like the rest of us, and it gives him mileage. This is all it does, it just makes him able to represent the interests of his tribe, freely, without being beholden to anyone and without being a hardship on him. The amendment would curtail this somewhat, but I as one of the co-sponsors am willing to go along with the amendment. I would hope that the full bill would be passed but if this is not possible I will accept the amendment, and I hope, I sincerely hope, that every one of you will grant this small, very, very small thing to the last remnants of the people who once ruled this entire State. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque.

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I somewhat this morning would like to agree with Mr. Richardson from Cumberland—somehow or other I lost the other corner this morning.

However, I would like to agree with the gentleman this morning because in the area that he has mentioned giving them their Constitutional rights as was granted by the State of Maine some years ago. However, I still feel that in the area of compensation that we're neither going to make or break any precedents as far as—by adopting the amendment that is suggested here this morning. Certainly we give them their Constitutional rights, we make sure that they participate in community affairs as much as they desire, and certainly

the legislative pays of all the members of this House and the other Branch have been increased somewhat since theirs were adjusted, so I don't feel that we are necessarily getting out of line by increasing their salary to half of what the present representation in this House is getting. I'll go along with the amendment on the \$1,000, fully recognizing that this is not giving them the full financial amount that the members of this House are getting, but somewhat possibly alleviating the financial burden on the representatives from the different Indian tribes. So, therefore, if we can see our way fit into detaining the motion to indefinitely postpone that we could adopt the amendment and somewhat relieve their financial pressures. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Portland, Mrs. Carswell.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I too hope that this amendment can be a compromise. I don't know what happened in the Republican Caucus, or how much they discussed this Indian matter. However, the House Chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, the Representative from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, talked with the Indian Representative John Nelson, before this matter was discussed on the Floor of the House, and they came to an agreement that perhaps a thousand dollars would be all right. I talked to the gentleman from Kittery, Mr. Dennett, several days ago and asked him, what happened? I didn't get an answer, so I hope we can solve it today.

Now, I feel that L. D. 186, the compensation and allowance pay bill is different than the reapportionment bill, and I think that the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, as an attorney should agree that there is a difference in these two bills. The Indian Affairs Commissioner says: "It seems to me the question of Indians voting for District Representatives, with or without reapportionment, should be separate from consideration of increasing the pay or allowance of the travel representatives."

Now we know that the Indians can't eat the stamps, they can't eat the telephone calls and they can't pitch a tepee on the State House lawn! They've got to travel back and forth, and it's quite a distance that they have to travel. Yet, they're only allowed ten trips and their bills are being tabled all the time, and—we're just being unreasonable about this. As I said before, I do hope that this thousand dollars, this amendment which I will propose, will be a compromise so that we can do something to better the lot of the Indians.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, that this Bill and Report be indefinitely postponed.

Mrs. Carswell of Portland requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call is requested.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I think I would be remiss in my duties if I did not get up here this morning. After hearing some of the statements made by my good friend from Portland, Mrs. Carswell, which I think she diverted on a lot of area, a lot of grounds.

There is one thing which has not been brought up here and which I am not much in favor of. We have a Department of Indian Affairs, and in that Department the Commissioner who administers their affairs pays some members of the tribes five dollars per person to come down here to push up one of his bills. That I do not go along with, and I think it shouldn't be tolerated. That's something which I think we should give careful thought, and these Departments go to work and pay people to come down here and testify to push up one of their bills is not right.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

For what purpose does the gentlewoman arise?

Mrs. CARSWELL: To explain something, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Carswell, of Portland was then given permission to speak a third time.

Mrs. CARSWELL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would like to clarify a point that this is not a Department bill. The Indian Governors have all written me and I have letters here saying that they are in favor of this bill, and there were no opponents to the bill at the Committee hearing. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise hoping that we will all support Mr. Richardson in defeating this bill.

The SPEAKER: For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present. All those desiring a roll call will vote yes, and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

56 voted in the affirmative and 61 voted in the negative.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call is ordered, and the pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson, that L. D. 186, Bill "An Act relating to Compensation and Allowances of the Members of the Indian Tribes at the Legislature," that the Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair will open the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA—Allen, Baker, E. B.; Beard, Benson, Berman, Binnette, Birt, Bragdon, Brown, Buck, Burnham, Carey, Carroll, Clark, Cote, Crockett, Crosby, Cushing, Darey, Dickinson, Drigotas, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Durgin, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Farrington, Fortier, Foster, Fuller, Gauthier, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harriman, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hewes, Hinds, Hodgkins, Huber, Humph-

rey, Immonen, Jalbert, Jannelle, Jewell, Keyte, Lewin, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lycette, Maddox, McMann, Meisner, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Pendergast, Philbrook, Porter, Prince, Quimby, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Ross, Scott, G. W.; Scribner, Shaw, Shute, Snow, P. J.; Snowe, P.; Soulas, Susi, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Waltz, Watts, Wight, Williams.

NAY—Belanger, Bernard, Boudreau, Bourgoin, Brennan, Carrier, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cornell, Cottrell, Couture, Crommett, Curran, Eustis, Fecteau, Fraser, Gaudreau, Giroux, Harnois, Harvey, Hennessey, Hichens, Hoover, Hunter, Jameson, Kilroy, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Lowery, Martin, Miliano, Minkowsky, Mosher, Quinn, Robertson, Rocheleau, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Starbird, Tanguay, Wheeler, White, Wood.

ABSENT — Baker, R. E.; Beliveau, Bradstreet, Bunker, Cookson, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dennett, McNally, Noyes, Payson, Pike, Robinson, Roy, Sahagian, Sullivan, Townsend.

Yes, 88; No, 45; Absent, 17.

88 having voted in the affirmative and 45 having voted in the negative, the Report and Bill were indefinitely postponed and sent up for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gaudreau.

Mr. GAUDREAU: Mr. Speaker, I move that we reconsider our action whereby item two, page seven, L. D. 298, was passed to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Gaudreau, now moves that the House reconsider its action whereby item two on page seven of your House Advance Journal was passed to be engrossed, Bill "An Act relating to Education of Members of Lewiston Police Department," House Paper 207, L. D. 298. All those in favor say yes; those opposed say no.



The motion prevailed.

Thereupon, on a viva voce vote, on motion of the same gentleman, the Bill was tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Thursday, May 4.

The Chair laid before the House the fifth item of Unfinished Business:

Bill "An Act Establishing the Policemen's Arbitration Law" (S. P. 342) (L. D. 926) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed)

Tabled—April 21, by Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor.

Pending—Passage to be engrossed.

Thereupon, Mr. Huber of Rockland offered House Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to S. P. 342, L. D. 926, Bill, "An Act Establishing the Policemen's Arbitration Law."

Amend said Bill by inserting after section 7 (same in L. D. 926) a new section, as follows:

'Sec. 7-A. R. S., T. 26, § 988, amended. The last sentence of section 988 of Title 26 of the Revised Statutes, as enacted by chapter 396 of the public laws of 1965, is amended to read as follows: A majority decision of the arbitrators shall not be final and binding upon either the bargaining agent or the corporate authorities.'

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Ewer.

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed, it is debatable.

Mr. EWER: This bill came out of the Committee "ought to pass" and it is a companion bill to the Firemen's Arbitration measure which we passed one or two sessions ago. It was a consensus of opinion of the Committee that arbitration should be binding as it was in the case of the firemen. So

while I am not going to make any motion on the acceptance or rejection of this amendment, I feel that the House should understand the feeling of the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Huber.

Mr. HUBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Actually this does no harm to the Policemen's Arbitration bill, which did come out of committee with an "ought to pass" report. All it does is clarify the situation as it stands at the present moment between the Arbitration and the Attorney General's Office. It clears it up as far as the communities are concerned.

Thereupon House Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill was passed to be engrossed as amended in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the sixth item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (9) — Ought to Pass — Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on Bill "An Act Prohibiting Hauling Lobster Pots on Sunday's (H. P. 240) (L. D. 348) — MINORITY REPORT (1) — Ought Not to Pass.

Tabled — April 21, by Mr. Quinn of Bangor.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Prince of Harpswell to accept Majority Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, through the Chair may I inquire of anyone who can give me the information as to the purpose of this bill?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, poses a question through the Chair to anyone who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I will be glad to, to the best of my ability.

The purpose of the bill is a conservation measure, as I understand it, and the key to the suc-

cess of the lobster industry annually depends on the short lobsters of the year before. In other words, about 92% of the lobsters caught annually in the State of Maine were short lobsters the year before.

On the weekends, and when the large flow of short lobster trapping takes place, that is the time when the Sea and Shore Fish Wardens are almost crazy. And, I believe the Lobstermen's Association felt that this was a conservation measure.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Thirty-five or forty years ago I had an out-of-state friend who used to visit Maine and with a great deal of enjoyment. So he always referred to our State as the land of tall pines and generous women.

Now if he were to return to Maine today, he'll find the tall pines gone, but thank God we still have those generous women. Then he'd find a new ingredient — selfishness. I think he'd call Maine today the land of generous women and selfish groups.

This bill, LD 348, is an example of a selfish group.

We are witnessing more and more groups who believe that they own certain of Maine's natural resources.

Early in the session, I told you of a group who own a camp on a wilderness lake in Northern Penobscot County; who through the inaction of this Legislative body, were successful in having that lake closed to ice fishing because they believe that the fish in that lake belong to them.

We see more and more land being posted with "No hunting" signs simply because the landowners assume that the land and the game on their lands are their own personal property.

A few weeks ago, our desks were cluttered up with a flood of letters from a group from the Patten area. They firmly believe that the bears in that area belong to them, so they want the State to

grant them the privilege to hunt those bears whenever they wish.

Here we have in L. D. 348 a sample of a group who falsely assume that the lobsters off the shores of this state are their personal property, of the lobster fishermen.

Ladies and gentlemen, the fish, the game, the bears and the lobsters are not owned by a few groups. The fish, game and lobsters belong to all of the citizens of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, could I inquire please on what the motion is now?

The SPEAKER: The motion is to accept the Majority Report.

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Over the many years, I have religiously followed the knowledgeable gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince, wherein it concerned itself to all lobster measures, and the record would prove this. Also I have a tremendous amount of personal respect for the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson. But, it appears to me in reading this bill the only good feature of the bill is the name of the sponsor on it. I would certainly probably not go so far as to say that this is a selfish measure, but it certainly appears to be that way.

Through my associations in the lobster country, the fine shores of Lincoln County over the many some thirty-odd years, I have grown to know personally a great many of the lobster fishermen.

As I commented by note one day to my good friend from Bristol, Mr. Lewis, it has been my pleasure on many, many Sundays over the last thirty years to stand on a wharf in Pemaquid and see the lobstermen come in with their catch, weigh in, and then go to their homes, after being out part of the night and the early — until nine or ten o'clock on Sunday morning. Yet I never saw any of them or knew any of them to be unhappy because they had or would do this on Sunday.

I haven't yet, in the last three weeks I have been in the lobster country on four occasions, and I inquired and I have yet to run into any strenuous opposition wherein it concerned the fact that we should prohibit people from the joy of pulling their traps on Sunday.

Now I think with due deference to the gentlemen who talked concerning conservation, I think their argument is weak, and I think in essence what this does is it would prohibit those people whose only day, after attending a church service of their choice, presuming they're not home Baptists, would allow themselves the privilege of going out to pull a few lobster traps if they have them, or going with somebody who does own them.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the indefinite postponement of this bill and all of its reports.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that both Reports and Bill be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As House Chairman of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries, I feel that it is my responsibility to inform the members of this House of the action that that Committee took.

First of all I would like to point out that the members of the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries are intelligent and capable men who reside in the coastal area of our State and are conversant on marine affairs. In executive hearing, we weighed the evidence very carefully. We took into consideration that at the public hearing there were approximately four hundred people there, and when the vote was taken seventy percent of that group were for the measure, and thirty percent were opposed.

Now we know that this bill met acceptance with the lobster dealers of the State of Maine. We know that this bill met acceptance with

the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries. We know that this bill meets the acceptance of the Lobstermen's Association.

We felt that this bill had a tendency to preserve the lobster industry and the fishermen who have a large investment, realizing that 90 to 92 percent of the legal lobsters caught in the State of Maine annually were short lobsters the year before. We put this into the category as a conservation measure.

Now to briefly outline to you the action that the Committee took are all these following points:

They considered this document a conservation program that did not call for any money.

They considered that the lobster industry served approximately seven thousand fishermen who make their entire livelihood from the catching of lobsters.

They took into consideration that the industry represented fifteen million dollars.

They considered this legislative document a restriction or a closed time such as Monhegan has. Monhegan has a closed time from June 1st to January 1st.

They considered this was a restriction perhaps compared with, like no hunting of deer on Sunday, or not being able to buy a pair of shoes in a large department store.

They took into consideration the storm area realizing that the fishermen who are conversant on tide, undertow, weather conditions, know that they had barometers, know that they had short-wave radios and were in constant touch with the Coast Guard and weather services.

They were aware of the fact that if a hurricane should take place during the months of June, July and August when this bill would be effective, that a hurricane would have at least eight or ten days notice.

We know that many of our fishermen don't go lobster fishing on Sunday for religious reasons. He can go if he so desires, and as far as I'm concerned men who observe a different Sabbath than Sunday have that same right.

This bill, if passed, would not be effective in 1967 because there

is no emergency program attached to it. We took into consideration that the enforcement would be taking place by the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries with a new plane that they have this year.

The lobster industry needs protection. Any law that will cut down the short lobster traffic is a great asset in the industry. We as legislators should be able to accept this fact and do whatever we can to help the industry.

Conservation and propagation is the only way we can keep the industry alive. Without this program the industry will collapse. A simple restriction like this bill, L. D. 348, if passed into law, could mean the difference between success and failure for our very important annual lobster industry. If we don't have restrictions we don't have lobsters, and ladies and gentlemen, it's just as simple as that. Let's help protect the famous Maine lobster, the one with the wiggle in the tail. This Committee reported this bill out 9 to 1 "ought to pass."

In conclusion, I would like to say this. As legislators I feel that it is our responsibility that if the demand in the lobster industry — if the demand is greater than the supply, then we should do everything that we could to help this situation. We on the Committee felt that this was a good step forward, and I hope that this House will accept the Majority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Durham, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This bill is aimed against the cottage owner. The man that works in industry and on Friday nights takes his little family down to the shore over a Friday night and Saturday and Sunday, and I contend the ocean and all the fish in it is everybody's, it belongs to the people of the State, just like all the animals in the woods belong to the people of the State.

Now you speak about conservation. Now a lobster that wanders into a trap, say on Saturday night — he's there, he's caught, he's

gone, he doesn't have nothing to do but sit around and chew the other lobsters all up, and I can't see any sense in waiting for Monday morning to come to get what's left of him out of the trap. Now there's a lot of people likes to catch crabs, and crab license costs just the same. A crab license costs ten dollars, and under this bill they wouldn't be able to catch any crabs, and I think it's selfish on the part of the big lobstermen not to want a little boy to catch a few crabs over the weekend. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brunswick, Mr. Lowery.

Mr. LOWERY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have been former Chairman of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee, and during the past year we had several meetings with the fishermen all along the Coast from Lubec to York Harbor. The consensus of opinion on the fishermen did bear out that there should be restrictions on fishing on Sundays, and on Saturdays. Most of the people wanted to take the two days. However, we've compromised on Sunday.

The lobster population is in danger because of this shortage. It's going to be very bad. I think that I will follow along with my Chairman and ask for a roll call vote.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I hesitate to rise to oppose a bill that is sponsored by such a fine gentleman as the gentleman from Southwest Harbor who represents a very fine group of people along the coast of Maine. Also I hesitate to oppose the fine group of gentlemen that we find on the Committee that represent the strong and rugged coast of Maine.

However, ladies and gentlemen, before coming to the big metropolis of the City of Brewer, I was a resident of a community located on the great coast of Maine, the home of this very controversial,

edible crustation of the depths of the sea, the very delicacy known as a lobster.

Now I understand that "delicacy" can be defined as a luxury, and certainly at the current price of \$1.45 a pound this insect can be classified in that category. I did say "insect," because I am informed by the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department that the lobster is an insect and that is why he is affected by this deadly DDT spray.

Now as a former herring choker, I can fully appreciate the importance and significance of this measure to limit Sunday lobster fishing, both to the industry and to the pleasure-seeker. I can equally well appreciate the position of those who are not in the industry but live in the coastal areas, or have cottages in its beautiful and scenic recreational areas. But as I peruse the entire picture, I must ask myself if this Legislature has the moral prerogative to mandate that we reserve the lobster to those in the business and say to the other citizens of Maine—we feel you shouldn't trap lobsters on Sunday because of those of us who do it for a living, don't care to pull our traps on Sunday. Besides, we feel it is detrimental to the lobster industry.

There is a serious question in my mind if we should deny those who have only the weekends to seek this fine seafood, the privilege of trapping a few lobsters for their own personal enjoyment. Incidentally I am informed that these lobsters taste just as delicious when caught on Sunday as they do any other day in the week. Now we are advised by the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, contrary to what I have heard stated here today, that the lobster population is not decreasing under our present laws. So, members of this Legislature, let's leave well enough alone and allow those who have only weekends to pull their five or ten traps, that right, that prerogative. Let's allow all the citizens of our great State of Maine equal rights to trap the lobster of his choice.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House; I have been listening with a great deal of pleasure to some of the inland fresh-water lobster fishermen discuss lobstering. I don't think—I've lived on the coast for a little over forty years—I have been involved with lobster fishermen a good part of those years. I don't think that the Maine lobster fisherman objects to the cottage owner who comes down to the coast and hauls his traps when he has a license to haul these traps.

One of the major things that the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries I think feels about this bill is that this will permit the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries to enforce the present laws about people hauling traps without a license.

We know a great deal of this goes on on Sunday. We see a great deal of it in our area, and I know that they do in other areas.

Apparently some of the opponents of this bill feel that lobstering is a recreation. We are referring to one of the major groups involved in the fishery in the State of Maine, we are referring to six thousand licensed lobster fishermen of which approximately thirty-five hundred are involved in full-time fishing to support a family as you and I support a family. We have been very concerned in this Legislature with a minimum wage for some of the workers in the State of Maine, but yet we don't feel that we want to protect the lobster fisherman. I can't see the consistency in the argument of the people that stump for these things.

I would like to remind my worthy friend from Lincoln, Mr. Porter, that forty years ago when he was referring to the people coming into the State of Maine, lobsters at that time were five cents a piece.

I don't know how many of you people realize what a lobster fisherman goes through. He gets up between three-thirty and four o'clock in the morning, has break-

fast and leaves the house and the mooring before daylight, and this is winter and summer. The year round fisherman, he has to fish in many different kinds of weather—he can't sit beside the fire because in lobstering you have to go and tend the traps. He gets back anywhere from six to seven o'clock at night. He pays a very large share of the sales tax in the State of Maine in relation to the amount of money that the industry brings in.

Frankly and truthfully, it would be my feeling that if this legislation is not passed, that we are serving the interests of a very special group—those people who only want to fish on weekends. And I cannot agree with everyone that the natural resources should be fished indiscriminately by everyone regardless of whether they are licensed or whether they're not; regardless of whether they are making a living out of it or not. Many areas of the Eastern Seaboard, some of the States now license a man to fish in only a specific section of it, an individuals right just the same as they have on the shore, in a farmer's field or a woodlot. Therefore, I would certainly hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I'm a bit sorry that the gentleman from Lincoln, Mr. Portier, feels that a full time lobsterman is selfish because he wishes to legislate for the best interest of his industry. Lobstering is an industry and it must be regulated and protected by rules and regulations just the same as all our other industries.

As far as the part time lobster fisherman, or the weekend fisherman if you wish to call him that, is concerned, he is participating on a part time basis in a full time industry. If he wishes to do this, he must have ten dollars for the license and sufficient money to purchase or build lobster traps, and this is all that he must have to participate in the lobster indus-

try. He participates in it on a part time basis, he puts his traps in the water, he hauls them Saturdays and Sundays in most instances. He leaves those traps untended during the week.

The full time lobster fisherman is not complaining about the part time lobsterman's participation to this extent, but they do wish to be able to make laws and regulations which will be in the best interest of the lobster industry. This Sunday lobster bill is such a law.

As Mr. Prince, the gentleman from Harpswell has told you, some four hundred, full time, lobster fishermen appeared at the hearing and better than seventy percent of those people expressed the desire for the passage of this legislation.

When I introduced this legislation, I did it with some doubt as to the feeling of the full time lobstermen along on the coast. I told many people who contacted me about it that I would be somewhat regulated by the people who came to the public hearing to express themselves. With the better than seventy percent expression in favor of this measure, I feel that I must now go along to the best of my ability for the passage of it.

If you will recall some of you have back some years ago when they enacted a law which made it illegal to keep a short lobster, they almost blew the dome off the State House—it was just a terrible thing. That was the one thing that has allowed the lobster industry to survive to the point that it is today. We must continue to be concerned about conservation measures, I am thoroughly convinced that this is a conservation measure, and I ask that you vote against the motion for indefinite postponement. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Healy.

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You've got to be fast on the draw here, Mr. Speaker, almost shoot from the hip!

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman and the members of the House that the Chair will not discriminate, he will rec-

ognize the first voice he hears. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HEALY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hear echoes of the 102nd Legislature: this is a bad bill. And now may I put a question to my good friend the gentleman and Adonis from Southwest Harbor, why only June, July and August? How about April, May, September, October and November? Of course I know they don't fish in the wintertime.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Healy, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Southwest Harbor, Mr. Benson, who may answer if he so chooses and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In answer to the question of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Healy, during the three months which are named in this bill, June, July and August, you have very, very little bad weather, weather during which the lobstermen would be concerned about their traps being in the shallow water. During the remainder of the year you run the very great risk of being involved in quick wind storms which are destructive to lobster fishing equipment and gear and it is for this reason. This is one of the reasons why we have named only June, July and August.

The second possibly even larger reason is the fact that the pirating of short lobsters takes place predominantly during the months of June, July and August, this is when the short lobsters taste extremely good on warm summer evenings on the shore enjoying a picnic, this is the very thing that we are trying to avoid, and it is only through the preservation of our short lobsters that we can continue to enjoy a healthy lobster industry. I hope this answers the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Auburn, Mr. Bernard.

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker, I too will echo the 102nd Legislature, for it saw fit to create a lobster study committee to study and investigate the management and protection of the lobster industry

in Maine. During the course of its investigation, the Committee became aware of the vast potential and tremendous importance of the lobster industry on the overall prosperity of the commercial fisheries. This committee brought forth many worthwhile recommendations. One such recommendation is spelled out in L. D. 348, which would limit the fishing efforts.

This Legislature must consider the full time lobster fisherman, his investment in gear, and the many families that are supported by the lobster industry. This House just recently defeated a non-commercial or sports type fishing bill. The interim committee recommended that until such quantities of lobsters are caught that are in excess of commercial demands, such a sports fishing or non-commercial type legislation should not be enacted.

Members of the House, we went along in defeating this bill. Now before us in essence is another of the committee's fine recommendations. To limit the fishing time, is this any different than hunting on Sunday? I personally would like to hunt Sundays. However, I've been able to get by these past sixteen years, containing myself to six days per week. The Committee further recommended that the Legislature support every effort made in research in the lobster programs. The efforts in research made by the cooperation between the Federal Labs and our Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries have advanced the research arts a great deal in the past years. Now the marine biologist can tag a lobster, and keep track of the lobster through several moltings. Studies are now being made on artificial habitations and their construction under water. The habits and solutions to many questions or problems posed by creatures who inhabit these mysterious depths are becoming less mysterious. Until more knowledge is made available by scientific research, sound conservation practices must be brought forward. In my opinion, L. D. #348 is an important for-

ward step in that direction. Most of the violations occur during the three summer months due to the fact that the majority of the lobstermen are not out policing their own gear on Sundays. This is when the short lobsters, but far more important, the seeders, are removed in violation of the fishing laws. Therefore, as an excellent step in the right direction, this conservation bill should be enacted.

Back in 1963 we had a bill before the Legislature allowing skin-divers to take lobsters for sport. This bill was defeated. We still have the right to take lobsters. We go down and get a license and fish them in traps. Now you say where is the conservation outlawing fishing on Sundays? From what I have been able to gather talking to knowledgeable people, and from my own personal experience, Sundays during the summer months is when many of the violations take place. Many skin-divers have been caught on Sundays taking lobsters. They were caught last year; some will be caught this year. Now one of the objections at the time was the Wardens could not enforce it. I think one of the best bills presented to us in this Legislature was the painting of the buoy colors on the boats. Now a person can stand on shore and watch the boats pulling traps and compare the colors; beautiful! This bill should have been brought before us fifty years ago.

My experience in observing things under water is pretty well known internationally. I have been at it quite a few years. I could take almost any member of this House who was in good health down any Sunday, down along the coast, and show you piles and piles of shells from short lobsters, and they weren't put there by commercial fishermen, they were put there by what I call weekend fishermen, and the opinion is, hell, we — excuse me, Mr. Speaker, the opinion is, there is no one around to watch us, we've got a camp here, we might as well take whatever comes in that trap, and therefore, I think in the long run this is a fine piece of

legislation if we pass it, and I think that in the next couple of years it will prove its merit. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Bath, Mr. Hennessey.

Mr. HENNESSEY: Mr. Speaker, in regards more or less in rebuttal to the gentleman from Freeport, and coming from an area in which there are a large number of cottages, these people have commercial licenses and they lose just as many lobsters on a Sunday as the commercial fishermen.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Huber.

Mr. HUBER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I would remind all of you that the lobster capitol of the world still happens to be in the State of Maine, and as a representative of that community I can assure you that all of us along the coast are very, very sensitive to the opinions and the feelings of the lobstermen themselves. I think every Legislature in recent years has had legislation for conservation of the lobster, and time after time after time legislators have sat here, opened mail, heard from home, and discovered the lobstermen didn't like this method of conservation. We have one now that they have expressed, and I can assure you that those of us who speak for it are well informed as to how the lobstermen themselves feel. They have spoken in favor of a piece of conservation legislation, and I sincerely think that this, which incidentally is a year 'round industry, this piece of legislation should get on the books if for no other reason than the gentlemen who haul the traps seem to know what the business is; they seem to think that this might be a step in the right direction.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. Maddox.

Mr. MADDOX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the ladies and gentlemen of the House that last year's catch was down five million pounds over the previous



five, twenty-four million pounds about five or six years ago.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have no argument with this bill, I think it is a good one. However, there are many areas of our coast where there are no lobsters and there is an abundance of crabs. I happen to live in one of those areas. Now every Sunday, or Saturday night, my two eleven year old boys and I go down and tent, put out crab traps and have a ball. This would prohibit us from doing that, and I work six days a week. I think if this bill could be tabled until—not be all inclusive on tidal waters, this particular bay is twelve miles from the coast where fishing is done for lobsters, but this is all inclusive. I think a lot better bill could be worked out in a short time and confine this to the lobster areas and not take all the rights away from the people as far as crabbing and so forth goes. So if somebody would table this bill so it could be worked over a little bit, I would go along with it.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn.

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I am not going to belabor you today with a long dissertation. I told you previously what I considered our duty here was to the people of the State of Maine and about the wild things of the State and that they belonged to everybody. Many of the previous speakers have gone into that area. One of the speakers says that we have a closed day on Sunday for hunting. That's not a conservation measure, that's a safety measure. Another one says, the gentleman from Stonington, my good friend, refers to the citizens of Maine as a special group; they are a special group, they are a fine group, and they should have their rights reserved.

I think highly of every member of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee. I consider them good

friends of mine. I consider them to be respectable gentlemen that are for the best interests of the State of Maine, but I have examined the area from which they come and they are all from the area of Eastport to Kittery, that very fine area, and they are in an area where there is a very fine product, and I think that is one of my weaknesses, the lobsters; that is my weakness. I like lobsters, I like to have them conserved, I'll do everything in this House to assist them in a legitimate program to develop their industry, but I will not do anything that will take away from the citizens of the State of Maine any rights that they have, and that's what this bill is doing.

Now since our last meeting here, I have had many people come to me and say I'm glad you spoke as you did for us folks that go down on the coast and enjoy having our family there during the summer, and several of them said to me, one of the things I look forward to from week to week is to put out half a dozen or so lobster traps and catch a few lobsters. Frequently a few friends will drop in on a Sunday and the first thing they want to know is where are our lobsters. They say to me, if they take away this privilege, I will lose one of the fine things in life that I look forward to.

I'm not going to say any more on this bill; you folks know what is for the best interest of your State, and you folks know that you are here representing all of the people of your State; you are not representing any particular special group, and this is what this bill serves is a special group that feel that they have a priority to the exclusion of all other citizens of the State of Maine.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Pendergast.

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of L. D. 348 and the Sea and Shores Fisheries Committee mine to one ought to pass report. This bill is a start towards conserving the lobster population and help stop the annual diminishing catch of the lobsters which is so important to the economy of our state. Therefore

I hope you will not vote to indefinitely postpone this bill.

Mr. Prince of Harpswell was granted permission to speak a third time.

MR. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker it disturbs me to belabor this bill but it is a very important bill if you are taking an industry into consideration. Experiences that I have along the coast of Maine with our cottagers, our summer guests, the majority of them are sympathetic with the fishermen, they understand their problems, and are willing to go along and do everything they can to help them.

I would like to remind the members of the House that back in 1936 lobster fishing in the State of Maine was almost at a standstill. We had 6,000 lobster fishermen then who had to be satisfied with \$800 or \$1200 for a gross return for the year. The poundage of our state amounted to around five million pounds, where today it amounts to around twenty million pounds. Something had to be done to increase the production of lobsters. The State of Maine legislature conceived of a method in raising money, the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries purchased a tremendous amount of seed lobsters from Canada. Those lobsters were liberated along the coast of Maine, it was a speculation, we didn't know whether the scheme would work or not, but if the idea was good it would take about seven years, the time that it takes for a lobster to come from a seed to a salable lobster. In seven years time lobsters began to increase. A sad situation took place in the lobster industry a few years ago after the fishermen had enjoyed the extra poundage whereby the State of Massachusetts was asking for a chicken lobster trade market. The State of New York, the State of Massachusetts and the State of Maine agreed that it would be a good business proposition, and the legislatures were to act upon this changing of the law. Our law at that time was 3-3-16 of an inch from the eye socket to the first crack in the back. The only legislatures that changed was the State of Maine. We changed our law to 3-1-16; Massachusetts and

New York did not change as they were supposed to do. The results were that the State of Maine had a Boston short lobster, so-called, lobsters that the dealers could not ship out of the State of Maine. The results were that lobsters became very cheap. The lobster fishermen had to strike. This was a violation of the anti-trust laws and the lobster fishermen were tried by a Federal Court and found guilty without a heavy fine.

I mention this only to remind you that there is constant peril and has been with the lobster industry, and I hope that you will recognize the fact that those of us who live on the coast are a little more conversant and familiar with the issue than someone that lives in the highlands. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette.

MR. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to any member of the Sea and Shore Fisheries who would care to answer. Do they have such a similar law on the coast of New England in other states and the Province of Canada?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette, poses a question through the Chair to any member of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee who may answer if they choose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince.

MR. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that any other state along the New England coast is really large enough in the lobster industry to make any regulations. The State of Maine is the largest lobster producing state in the United States and we should be recognized as a barometer state. We are sandwiched in between a highly competitive Canadian market and always an unsettled market condition in New York and Boston. The English Government subsidizes the Canadian fishermen for the rope and the gear that they use. It builds breakwaters and warehouses. It does everything that it can.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that he has

spoken three times and if he wishes to continue debating he must have the permission of the House.

Mr. PRINCE: I ask that permission and I am almost through.

Mr. Prince of Harpswell was granted permission to speak a fourth time.

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker, it is my thinking that the Canadians who do have a closed time in all of their provinces and open times, I think most everyone knows that, and they do this for conservation reasons. I believe that the Canadian market, which is a threat to the Maine lobster market, are concerned with the idea in the consumer's mind that they are eating a Maine lobster, which again is a difficult situation for the State of Maine lobster fishermen. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that both reports and Bill "An Act Prohibiting Hauling Lobster Pots on Sundays" House Paper 240, L. D. 348 be indefinitely postponed. A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call, it must have the expressed desire of one-fifth of the members present. All those who desire a roll call will vote yes and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

84 voted in the affirmative and 28 voted in the negative.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, more than one-fifth having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call is ordered, and the pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that this bill and both reports be indefinitely postponed. All those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair will open the vote.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA—Allen, Baker, E. B.; Belanger, Binnette, Bourgoin, Brennan, Brown, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Cornell, Cote, Couture, Crockett, Crommett, Curran, Dickinson, Drigotas,

Dunn, Eustis, Evans, Farrington, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Gauthier, Giroux, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harnois, Hawes, Haynes, Healy, Hewes, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Jannelle, Keyte, Kyes, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Lycette, Martin, Miliano, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Porter, Quimby, Quinn, Robertson, Scribner, Snow, P. J.; Starbird, Susi, Tanguay, Wheeler, Wight, Williams, Wood.

NA Y—Bedard, Benson, Berman, Bernard, Birt, Boudreau, Bragdon, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Clark, Conley, Cottrell, Crosby, Cushing, Darey, Drummond, Dudley, Durgin, Ewer, Fuller, Gill, Hall, Hanson, B. B.; Harriman, Henley, Hennessey, Hichens, Hinds, Hodgkins, Hoover, Huber, Humphrey, Immonen, Lewis, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lowery, Maddox, McMann, Meisner, Mosher, Noyes, Pendergast, Philbrook, Prince, Rackliff, Richardson, G. A.; Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Rocheleau, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Thompson, Trask, Waltz, Watts, White.

ABSENT—Baker, R. E.; Beliveau, Bradstreet, Cookson, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dennett, Edwards, Gaudreau, Harvey, Jewell, Kilroy, McNally, Nadeau, N. L.; Payson, Pike, Robinson, Ross, Roy, Sahagian, Sullivan, Townsend, Truman.

Yes, 63; No, 64; Absent, 23.

The SPEAKER: Sixty-three having voted in the affirmative, sixty-four having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

The Chair laid before the House the seventh item of Unfinished Business:

Resolve Regulating Fishing in Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County (H. P. 505) (L. D. 718)

Tabled—April 25, by Mr. Crommett of Millinocket.

Pending—Adoption of Committee Amendment "A" (H-203) as amended by House Amendment "A" thereto (H-208)

On motion of Mr. Crommett of Millinocket, the House voted to suspend the rules and to reconsider its action of April 25 whereby House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted, and to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A."

Whereupon the same gentleman offered House Amendment "E" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "E" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "E" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 505, L. D. 718, Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County.

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of the first paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Amend said Resolve in the Title by striking out the words "Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County" and inserting in place thereof the following: "Beaver Tail Pond, T. 14, R. 10 and T. 14, R. 9, and Fish River Falls, Aroostook County, Long Pond, Kennebec County, and Millimagassett Lake, Penobscot County.'

Further amend said Amendment by striking out the period and single quotation mark at the end and inserting in place thereof the following:

'; and be it further

**Fishing in Long Pond of Belgrade Lakes, Rome and Belgrade Townships, Kennebec County.**

**Resolved:** That there shall be no bag limit on white perch in Long Pond of Belgrade Lakes, Rome and Belgrade Townships, Kennebec County; and be it further

**Fishing in Fish River Falls regulated.**

**Resolved:** That there shall be no fishing in Fish River Falls, T. 13, R. 8, Aroostook County, from the falls to a point 200 feet below the falls from time of ice out to June 15th of each year; and be it further

**Fishing in Millimagassett Lake, Penobscot County**

**Resolved:** That the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game is authorized and directed

to issue a rule and regulation opening Millimagassett Lake, T. 7, R. 8, W. E. L. S., Penobscot County, to ice fishing from January 1st to March 31st only for a period of 2 years from the effective date of this resolve and thereafter said commissioner is authorized and directed to regulate all fishing in said Millimagassett Lake at his discretion.'

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett may proceed.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a legislative procedure which is perfectly proper. It serves the purpose of reconsideration. I feel that some of the members of this House do not fully understand the fundamental principle involved here. I will say now, ladies and gentlemen, I am indebted to those who participated in the bill preceding this, and I am most grateful for their comments.

In allowing the decision of the Inland Fish and Game Commissioner to stand closing Millimagassett Lake to ice fishing after the public hearing in Lincoln last fall, strikes at the very foundation of our democratic form of government. Integrity and faithfulness to duty, minus any conflict of interest, should be the primary objective of all public officials. Now those who voted in the affirmative and then in the negative thinking that a purpose had been served are misinformed, and to me, ladies and gentlemen, that is fuzzy thinking. It has been suggested, and I am sure that it will be considered in time, that fish and game biologists as well as Game Wardens be prohibited from testifying in public. Any knowledge these capable and talented public servants might have will be given to the Commissioner who might or might not accept it as he sees fit. I would like the members of this House to look at this amendment in a new light and base their judgment on the merits of the bill, for you and only you, have to live with your conscience.

A few days ago this House killed a bill, and wisely so, that would

regulate motors on Sourdnhunk Lake. It would seem that that bill was designed to regulate people and not fish. The same thing applies to the closing of Millimagassett Lake to ice fishing. The management and regulation of people are not the function of the Department of Inland Fish and Game. The Department of Inland Fisheries and Game is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the fish and game laws that are enacted by the Legislature. This Legislature and preceding Legislatures have forced on the Department other duties while the Department has asked for more responsibility. Tuesday, this House insisted on the Commissioner being a member of the State Soil and Water Conservation Commission. April 26 there was a hearing on an act to regulate snowsleds, a bill sponsored by the Department. The Commissioner is a member of the State Park and Recreation Commission, he is a member of the Bureau of Watercraft Regulations and Safety, he is also a member of the Pesticide Control Board, a member of the Atlantic Sea Run Salmon Commission, a member of the Baxter Park Authority, and agreeable to accepting the Chairmanship. The Warden Service of the Department is charged with policing the litterbug law. They are also charged with enforcing the rules of the Bureau of Watercraft. As noted above, the Department would also like to police the snowsleds. If all this is good, perhaps the request by the Commissioner for a salary increase is justified. The fish belongs to no one until it is hooked. This statement was made by the Commissioner and I am sure Mr. Speaker, you will agree most heartily, for the statement was made in Washington County when a select group tried to influence the Commissioner that certain fish belonged to them because of their locality. But with the advice of the council on some occasions the Commissioner makes rules to regulate and manage people so as to limit the chance of certain groups of people from ever having a chance to hook one. The people

of Lincoln and Millinocket are interested in all good fish and game laws. Their interest should not be questioned. The interest of the people from other parts of the state in regards to Millimagassett Lake is well known. These people are part owners of a camp on the lake or fishing companions of those who do claim ownership. From an Old Town office these people were directed to appear at the Augusta hearing not fully convinced of the logic of their request for closing this lake to ice fishing. They proceeded to overwhelm the Committee by sheer force of numbers. The Advisory Council to the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game is composed of seven members appointed by the Governor with the advice of the Executive Council, one for each Councillor District. The appointment is purely political. Their qualifications are secondary. It seems they are sophisticated fly fishermen; this being so, it seems they cannot properly advise the Commissioner without a conflict of interest thereby being biased and prejudiced.

There is a question in my mind as to the advisability of retaining the Advisory Council to the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Game. It is my honest judgment the hearing at Lincoln last fall was window-dressing to comply with the statutes. These statements I have made, ladies and gentlemen, are for your consideration and I hope you will vote to adopt the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Is it now the pleasure of the House that House Amendment "E" to Committee Amendment "A" be adopted?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In my individual capacity and not as the Majority Floor Leader, I must take exception to the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett. If you will look at this House Amendment "E", the gist of it is there are two other amendments pending and then it adds on what is apparently the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr.

Crommett's favorite issue, and that is whether or not ice fishing in Millimagassett Lake shall be opened.

I would remind you that this subject was exhaustively debated in this House, that it passed the House, that the Senate voted to indefinitely postpone it in non-concurrence, that it came back to us and we receded and concurred. I think that we lose some of our sense of responsibility if we are going to repeatedly over and over and over again go over the merits of legislation which has already come before us and has failed. I think the merits of this bill have been fully and exhaustively debated before. I hope that you will not permit House Amendment "E" to be added to the legislation now before us, and when the vote is taken I request a division.

Now as I understand it, the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin, has an amendment which he wishes to present. This will apparently combine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Belgrade, Mr. Sahagian and that of the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin. I have no objection to those because the merits of those have not been debated. The merits of House Amendment "E" presented by the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett, have been debated time and time and time again, and I very strenuously urge as an individual that you not go along with House Amendment "E." Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird.

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker, I went on record in support of Mr. Crommett as regard to Millimagassett Lake when it was debated on the Floor of this House before and I would like to go on it again. I agree with Mr. Richardson, the matter has been debated enough. I think we are all fully aware of what has gone on up there so I will not talk on the subject, but I would request that when the vote is taken, it be taken by a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: House Amendment "E" to Committee Amendment "A" to L. D. 718, Resolve Regulating Fishing in Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County. Now Third Chase Pond with the adoption of the amendment, the Committee amendment, is a different pond altogether, and it changed it to Beaver Tail Pond. Now that is perfectly all right, I have no objection to that. Now this is sponsored by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game, and for some reason or other there was objection, then the Committee came out with this amendment. Now it seems to me there is a difference of opinion whether the Fish and Game Committee should represent the public or the Department, and I have no objection to that amendment.

Now this amendment of Mr. Sahagian of Belgrade Lakes is perfectly proper. I don't know whether there was a hearing on that or not. Now there is another part of this amendment, fishing in Fish River Falls, whether that was heard or not I don't know, and I have no objection to it. Certainly, the question of whether the Millinocket - Millimagassett Lake should be opened to ice fishing or not has been discussed. That's what we're here for. It's a parliamentary procedure or Legislative procedure that many people use as apart from reconsideration, and when you move to kill this because it has been discussed I can't go along with that. I would like you to look at the merits of the bill.

The previous speakers on the other bill before this speaking for favored groups, and this is a favored group that the closing of this lake was for. Now if you represent the people and as the Commissioner of Inland Fisheries has stated, and he stated it in Washington County, that no fish belong to anyone until you get your hook in it. Well now if you regulate people in such a way that they don't have an opportunity to try to hook one, it's not right by any means, and I would certainly hope you would

go along and adopt this amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Ewer.

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I voted against this measure when it was an independent bill. I shall vote against the amendments that are being offered in regard to Millimagassett Lake, and with regard to the motion for the roll call by the gentleman from Kingman Township, Mr. Starbird, I would like to say that I don't like this principle of asking for a roll call on everything. I don't object to going on record, we do go on record when we take an ordinary vote on a division, and I feel that we can save some time for ourselves and get the same results if we do not go to the time of taking a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The question pending is the adoption of House Amendment "E" and to Committee Amendment "A" and a roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of the members present and voting. All those in favor of having a roll call will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 16 voted in the affirmative and 75 voted in the negative.

The SPEAKER: Obviously, an insufficient number having arisen, a roll call is not ordered. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of the adoption of House Amendment "E" to Committee Amendment "A" will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 24 having voted in the affirmative and 76 having voted in the negative, House Amendment "E" to Committee Amendment "A" failed of adoption.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that L. D. 718 and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would advise the gentleman that the adoption or indefinite postponement of Committee Amendment "A" is the pending question.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Eagle Lake, Mr. Martin.

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I offer House Amendment "C" to Committee Amendment "A" which excludes Millimagassett Lake, and I would point out that this bill was my bill and was not a Departmental bill, but I will admit that I spoke with them and asked for their information and their advice which they gladly gave.

Thereupon, House Amendment "C" to Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "C" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 505, L. D. 718, Resolve, Regulating Fishing in Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County.

Amend said Amendment by striking out all of the first paragraph and inserting in place thereof the following:

'Amend said Resolve in the Title by striking out the words "Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County" and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Beaver Tail Pond, T. 14, R. 10 and T. 14, R. 9, and Fish River Falls, Aroostook County, and Long Pond, Kennebec County'

Further amend said Amendment by striking out the period and single quotation mark at the end and inserting in place thereof the following:

'; and be it further

**Fishing in Long Pond of Belgrade Lakes, Rome and Belgrade Townships, Kennebec County.**

**Resolved:** That there shall be no bag limit on white perch in Long Pond of Belgrade Lakes, Rome and Belgrade Townships, Kennebec County; and be it further

**Fishing in Fish River Falls regulated.**

**Resolved:** That there shall be no fishing in Fish River Falls, T. 13, R. 8, Aroostook County, from the falls to a point 200 feet below

the falls from time of ice out to June 15th of each year.'

House Amendment "C" to Committee Amendment "A" was adopted. Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "C" thereto was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett.

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I now move that L. D. 718 and all its accompanying papers be indefinitely postponed.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Millinocket, Mr. Crommett, now moves that Resolve regulating Fishing in Third Chase Pond, Aroostook County be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland, Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the indefinite postponement and would request a division on the motion.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested. All those in favor of this Resolve and its accompanying papers will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

14 having voted in the affirmative and 93 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" as amended by House Amendment "C" thereto and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the eighth item of Unfinished Business:

An Act relating to Practitioners of Funeral Service, Funeral Directors and Embalmers (H. P. 989) (L. D. 1467)

Tabled—April 25, by Mr. Haynes of Camden.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

Thereupon, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The Chair laid before the House the ninth item of Unfinished Business:

An Act relating to Licensing of Premises for Dancing Purposes (S. P. 83) (L. D. 164)

Tabled—April 25, by Mr. Danton of Old Orchard Beach.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, the House voted to suspend the rules, to reconsider its action of March 31 whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A", to reconsider the adoption of House Amendment "A" on the same date and to indefinitely postpone House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

Thereupon, the same gentleman offered House Amendment "B" and moved its adoption.

House Amendment "B" was read by the Clerk as follows:

HOUSE AMENDMENT "B" to S. P. 83, L. D. 164, Bill, "An Act relating to Licensing of Premises for Dancing Purposes."

Amend said Bill in that part designated "\$161." by adding at the end of the first paragraph (same in L. D. 164) the following underlined sentence:

**'This paragraph shall not apply to dances conducted by and for students in either public, private or state-owned school buildings or municipally-owned buildings.'**

Further amend said Bill in that part designated "\$161." by adding at the end of the 5th paragraph the following underlined sentence: **'No fee shall be required for the inspection of public, private or state-owned school buildings or municipally-owned buildings.'**

House Amendment "B" was adopted, the Bill passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" and House Amendment "B" in non-concurrence and sent up for concurrence.

The Chair laid before the House the tenth item of Unfinished Business:

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (9)—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act Providing Additional



Funds for Education by Sweep-stake Races" (H. P. 384) (L. D. 531)—MINORITY REPORT (1)—Ought to pass.

Tabled—April 26, by Mr. Dennett of Kittery.

Pending—His motion to accept Majority Report.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, retabled pending the motion of Mr. Dennett of Kittery to accept the Majority Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 2.

The Chair laid before the House the eleventh item of Unfinished Business:

Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Pledging Credit of State and Providing for the Issuance of Bonds Not Exceeding, at Any One Time Issued and Outstanding, Twenty-Five Million Dollars for Loans to Private Colleges for Construction and Expansion of Facilities (S. P. 60) (L. D. 73)

Tabled—April 26, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Pike of Lubec to indefinitely postpone.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from China, Mr. Farrington.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that Mr. Pike, the gentleman from Lubec, indicated an interest in this bill and he is not present today, I would hope someone would table this matter until May 2.

Thereupon on motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Pike of Lubec to indefinitely postpone and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 2.

The Chair laid before the House the twelfth item of Unfinished Business:

An Act Creating the Maine Higher Education Loan Authority Act (S. P. 59) (L. D. 72)

Tabled—April 27, by Mrs. Hanson of Lebanon.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

On motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, retabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 2.

The Chair laid before the House the first tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT (8) — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize Food Stamp Program in Sagadahoc County" (H. P. 660) (L. D. 915)—MINORITY REPORT (2)—Ought to Pass.

Tabled—April 21, by Mr. Ross of Bath.

Pending—Acceptance of either Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross.

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the Minority "Ought to pass" Report and I would speak briefly to the motion.

For those of you who were in the last Legislature, you will recall considerable debate on a proposed food stamp plan as suggested at that time by Governor Reed. This was finally passed as a pilot project for Androscoggin County. The Department of Health and Welfare has been very pleased with the results and included it in its recommendations for the coming biennium. I sincerely hope that the allocation will be approved and that the county selected is Sagadahoc.

The operation itself is extremely interesting. The United States Department of Agriculture establishes certain standard low income food budgets. As an example, let's assume that for a certain size family this is forty dollars per week. However, because of financial difficulties, our family in question has only been able to afford thirty dollars each week. They would then turn over thirty dollars in cash to the Department of Health and Welfare. They would receive the budget amount of forty dollars in the form of food stamps.

They then take their stamps to a participating grocery store and spend them just like money. They are not allowed to use them to pay back bills, and neither can they be converted into cash. The grocer deposits the stamps in a bank and, as with checks, he receives full credit to his account. The bank

then claims its credit against the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston. The entire program is policed by the Federal Department of Agriculture.

The whole plan is most unique and appears to work to everyone's advantage. In Androscoggin County about seven hundred families with a total of 2,700 persons are now getting thirty percent more food each week than ever before. The stores are delighted to participate since sales have increased on an average of fifteen percent.

Very often welfare programs per se tend to discourage human incentives. Nevertheless, this program is so different in its approach, that in my opinion, it should be given careful consideration as eventually a statewide project. However, until such a time, I surely hope that this committee will approve Sagadahoc County as a second pilot project.

Perhaps in the final analysis, the demise of this bill is inevitable. It may be that we will not have \$18,000 per year for an extra project such as this no matter how worthy the cause. However, I hope that this will be given very careful consideration with the other money bills later on, and if it does die, I hope we will let it expire with grace and dignity on the Appropriations table of the other body and not at our cruel hands today, the last Friday of April, 1967.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Hinds.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In defense of the ought not to pass majority report of the Appropriations Committee, I might add that the Department of Health and Welfare had requested sufficient funds in their supplemental budget to carry on a food stamp program in every county in the State. We have one county now, Androscoggin, that has a food stamp program.

The total membership of the Appropriations Committee didn't see fit to include this in the supplemental budget and it was deleted for all counties except Androscog-

gin which is running at the present time. I would think if we expand this program any more that any legislator from any county could be expected to request the same treatment in each of their counties, and I would hope that the ought to pass report would not be accepted so that we might accept the ought not to pass report of a majority of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McMann.

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Just to add a few words to what Representative Ross said, this bill has been okayed by the Council of the City of Bath, by the City Manager and by the Welfare Commissioner of Bath. They say they can give the people more food per dollar.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bath, Mr. Ross, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act to Authorize Food Stamp Program in Sagadahoc County," House Paper 660, L. D. 915.

Mr. Hinds of South Portland requested a vote.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. All those in favor of accepting the Minority "Ought to pass" Report will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 64 having voted in the affirmative and 45 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail, the Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

The Chair laid before the House the second tabled and today assigned matter:

HOUSE REPORT—Ought to Pass with Committee Amendment "A" (H-168)—Committee on Indian Affairs on Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds to Update the Surveys of Penobscot Tribal Lands" (H. P. 751) (L. D. 1098)

Tabled—April 25, by Mr. Nadeau of Sanford.

Pending—Acceptance.

On motion of Mrs. Carswell of Portland, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted and the Bill read twice.

Committee Amendment "A" was read by the Clerk as follows:  
**COMMITTEE AMENDMENT**  
 "A" to H. P. 751, L. D. 1098, Bill, "An Act Appropriating Funds to Update the Surveys of Penobscot Tribal Lands."

Amend said Bill by striking out in the 4th line of section 1 (3rd

line of L. D. 1098) the words "preparing forest management plans and"

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Bill assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, at ten o'clock in the morning.