

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

Volume II

May 10 to June 15, 1967

**KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE**

HOUSE

Friday, May 12, 1967

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

Prayer by the Rev. Mr. Richard V. Rokos of Augusta.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Papers from the Senate

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Providing for the Purchase of Land by the Seed Potato Board" (S. P. 640) (L. D. 1646)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Agriculture in concurrence.

From the Senate:

Bill "An Act Describing Indian Voting Districts" (S. P. 639) (L. D. 1645)

Came from the Senate referred to the Committee on Senatorial Reapportionment.

In the House, referred to the Committee on Senatorial Reapportionment in concurrence.

Senate Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Report of the Committee on Claims on Resolve in favor of Alfred Sears of Pembroke (S. P. 532) (L. D. 1367) reporting Leave to Withdraw.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting Leave to Withdraw on Bill "An Act relating to Challenges of Jurors in Criminal Cases" (S. P. 159) (L. D. 330)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Report was read.

(On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, tabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting Leave to Withdraw on Bill "An Act Concerning Discovery in Personal Injury Litigation of Applicable Liability Insurance" (S. P. 431) (L. D. 1085)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Covered by Other Legislation

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Issuance of Bonds in the Amount of Eight Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars on Behalf of the State of Maine for Improvements at the Portland Municipal Airport" (S. P. 424) (L. D. 1078) reporting Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass Tabled and Assigned

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act to Authorize Construction of Self-liquidating Student Housing and Dining Facilities for the Eastern Maine Vocational-Technical Institute and the Issuance of not Exceeding One Million One Hundred and Twenty-seven Thousand Dollar Bonds of the State for the Financing Thereof" (S. P. 423) (L. D. 1077)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

In the House, Report was read. (On motion of Mr. Quinn of Bangor, tabled pending acceptance in concurrence and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.)

Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing a Bond Issue in the Amount of Seven Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for a Vocational Educational Institute in Lincoln County (S. P. 527) (L. D. 1363)

Report of the Committee on Judiciary reporting same on Bill

"An Act relating to Appeals by State on Questions of Law in Criminal Cases" (S. P. 473) (L. D. 1165)

Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs reporting same on Bill "An Act relating to the Registration of Professional Sanitarians and Sanitarian Trainees (S. P. 343) (L. D. 927)

Came from the Senate read and accepted.

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

Ought to Pass in New Draft

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Changing the Foundation Program Per Pupil Allowances" (S. P. 256) (L. D. 636) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 638) (L. D. 1642) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The document that is just before us, L. D. 686 or the New Draft 1642 comes out today in New Draft as a unanimous committee report. It is probably through lack of communication or through lack of direct communication or misunderstanding between L. D. 636 and 1642 that this comes out by unanimous report. When the question was asked for a redraft of this bill, I as a member of the committee certainly, and the others will speak for themselves, if they have to, the redraft or the new draft with the total amount was going to come back to the committee for signature. Inadvertently it didn't. From the Department of Education it went to Sam Slosberg's office and was signed out by the Committee Chairman, and it was explained by the Committee Chairman that inadvertently it was one of these lack of communication

errors that there was not a divided report on it.

So I would just like to make this clear to the House that I am getting an amendment ready so that it will clearly show that this would have been a divided report if the line of communication would have been as they have been normally throughout the session with the Education Committee. Thank you.

Mr. Carroll of Limerick was granted unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I also am a member of the Committee who requested that this redraft come back to me for the opportunity to read this redraft and to approve or disapprove. This redraft was never seen by me until I found a copy on my desk. Therefore, I was willing to go along with certain things in 636 but I am not willing to go along with the fact that fifty-two towns receive less under 636, and therefore, I feel that this should have been a divided report instead of a majority report, and this is my position as a member of the Education Committee on this legislative document.

Report of the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act to Revise the Laws Relating to Authority for Granting Degree and to Approval of Degree-Granting Institutions" (S. P. 533) (L. D. 1368) reporting same in a new draft (S. P. 637) (L. D. 1641) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Came from the Senate with the Report read and accepted and the New Draft passed to be engrossed.

In the House, the Report was read and accepted in concurrence, the New Draft read twice and assigned the next legislative day.

Non-Concurrent Matter

An Act to Regulate the Practice of Psychologists (S. P. 619) (L. D. 1611) which was passed to be enacted in the House on May 10 and passed to be engrossed on May 5.

Came from the Senate passed to be engrossed as amended by Senate Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the House: The House voted to recede and concur with the Senate.

Orders

On motion of Mr. Benson of Southwest Harbor, the following Enactor was taken up out of order without objection:

Passed to Be Enacted Emergency Measure

An Act relating to Comprehensive Planning Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (S. P. 617) (L. D. 1615)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 107 voted in favor of same and 1 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent forthwith to the Senate.

House Reports of Committees Leave to Withdraw

Mrs. Baker from the Committee on Education on 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 Million Dollars for Loans to Private Secondary Schools for Construction and Expansion of Facilities (H. P. 886) (L. D. 1300) reported Leave to Withdraw.

Report was read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Littlefield from the Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Bill "An Act Defining Certain Vessels as an Industrial Project under the Industrial Building Authority" (H. P. 899) (L. D. 1312) reported Leave to Withdraw, as covered by other legislation.

Mr. Sahagian from the Committee on Liquor Control reported same on Bill "An Act Providing Local Option for Sunday Sales" (H. P. 635) (L. D. 891)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill

"An Act Providing Local Option for Sunday Sales of Liquor by Hotels and Restaurants" (H. P. 804) (L. D. 1180)

Same gentleman from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor" (H. P. 1019) (L. D. 1483)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

Mr. Crommett from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Approval of Pay to Cumberland County Probation Officers" (H. P. 557) (L. D. 789)

Mr. Nadeau from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act Establishing Clerk of Courts in Somerset County as Full-Time" (H. P. 429) (L. D. 593)

Mr. Robertson from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act to Annex Brunswick and Harpswell to Sagadahoc County" (H. P. 682) (L. D. 1047)

Reports were read and accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Covered by Other Legislation

Mr. Rackliff from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Firearms in Camps under Fish and Game Laws" (H. P. 357) (L. D. 504) 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

Mr. Allen from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Providing State Scholarships for Higher Education" (H. P. 463) (L. D. 676) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1155) (L. D. 1652) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Mr. Carrier from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions on Bill "An Act Improving Payment of Benefits under the Maine State Retirement System Law" (H. P. 376) (L. D. 523) reported same in a new draft (H. P. 1156) (L. D. 1653) under same title 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. Littlefield from the Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development reported "Ought to pass" on Resolve Proposing Study of Feasibility of Making the Kennebec Arsenal an Historic Site (H. P. 835) (L. D. 1243)

Mr. Nadeau from the Committee on Towns and Counties reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Nonlapsing Funds for Land in Town of Wells for Park Purposes" (H. P. 771) (L. D. 1118)

Mr. Wight from same Committee reported same on Bill "An Act relating to Expending Aroostook County Funds for Maine Potato Blossom Festival" (H. P. 169) (L. D. 232)

Reports were read and accepted, the Bills read twice, Resolve read once, and assigned the next legislative day.

**Ought to Pass with
Committee Amendment**

Mr. Quimby from the Committee on Claims on Resolve to Reimburse Mrs. Hazel Costigan, of Milford, for Well Damage (H. P. 475) (L. D. 688) reported "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was read and accepted and the Resolve read once.

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

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 475, L. D. 688, Resolve, to Reimburse Mrs. Hazel Costigan, of Milford, for Well Damage.

Amend said resolve in the Title by striking out the word "Costigan" and inserting in place thereof the word 'Carson'

Further amend said resolve by striking out everything after the Title and inserting in place thereof the following:

Mrs. Hazel Carson; reimbursed.

Resolved: That there is appropriated from the General Highway Fund the sum of \$600 to be paid to Mrs. Hazel Carson of Milford, for

damage to her well caused by highway construction on Route 2.'

Committee Amendment "A" was adopted and the Resolve assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Mr. Richardson from the Committee on Education on Bill "An Act relating to Financial Matters of the Mount Desert Island Regional School District" (H. P. 1128) (L. D. 1605) 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. 1128, L. D. 1605, Bill, "An Act Relating to Financial Matters of the Mount Desert Island Regional School District."

Amend said Bill in the Title by adding after the word "District" the following: 'and Authorizing School Administrative District No. 48 to Take Water from Nokomis Pond'

Further amend said Bill by inserting before the emergency clause, the following section:

Sec. 3. School Administrative District No. 48 authorized to take water from Nokomis Pond. School Administrative District No. 48 is authorized to take, use and distribute water from Nokomis Pond in the Town of Newport for school purposes in connection with the school building located on land adjacent to said Nokomis Pond.'

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

Mr. Nadeau from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill "An Act Increasing Fees for Sheriffs and Deputies" (H. P. 1047) (L. D. 1519) 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. 1047, L. D. 1519, Bill, "An

Act Increasing Fees for Sheriffs and Deputies.”

Amend said Bill by inserting after the word “criminal” in the 3rd line from the end (same in L. D. 1519) the underlined words ‘or civil’

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

Mr. Robertson from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill “An Act Increasing the Number of Medical Examiners for the County of Oxford” (H. P. 1006) (L. D. 1473) 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. 1006, L. D. 1473, Bill, “An Act Increasing the Number of Medical Examiners for the County of Oxford.”

Amend said Bill by inserting at the beginning before the enacting clause the following:

‘Emergency preamble. Whereas, Acts and resolves passed by the Legislature do not become effective until 90 days after adjournment unless enacted as emergencies; and

Whereas, the shortage of medical examiners has created a problem in adequate county coverage which is of vital importance to the welfare of the State of Maine; and

Whereas, it is vitally necessary that the following legislation become effective immediately so that efforts may be made to solve this problem; and

Whereas, in the judgment of the Legislature, these facts create an emergency within the meaning of the Constitution of Maine and require the following legislation as immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety; now therefore,

Further amend said Bill by inserting at the end the following:

‘Emergency Clause. In view of the emergency cited in the preamble, this Act shall take effect when approved.’

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

Mr. Snowe from the Committee on Towns and Counties on Bill “An Act relating to Municipal Appropriation of Money for Volunteer Fire Departments” (H. P. 254) (L. D. 362) 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. 254, L. D. 362, Bill, “An Act Relating to Municipal Appropriation of Money for Volunteer Fire Departments.”

Amend said Bill in the 4th and 5th lines (3rd and 4th lines in L. D. 362) by striking out the underlined figures and words “1/5 of 1% of the next previous state valuation of the municipality” and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure “\$1,000”

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs reporting “Ought to pass” on Bill “An Act Increasing Borrowing Power of Maine Maritime Academy” (H. P. 128) (L. D. 192), which was recommitted.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. DUQUETTE of York
—of the Senate.

Messrs. JALBERT of Lewiston
BRAGDON of Perham
HUMPHREY of Augusta
BIRT of East Millinocket
HINDS of South Portland
SCRIBNER of Portland
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting “Ought not to pass” on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

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

Mr. DUNN of Denmark
—of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Stonington, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act Providing for Hunting Moose in Certain Portions of Aroostook County for 1967 and 1968" (H. P. 496) (L. D. 709)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. HOFFSES of Knox
ANDERSON of Hancock
FARLEY of York
—of the Senate.

Messrs. THOMPSON of Belfast
HAYNES of Camden
LEWIN of Augusta
COOKSON of Glenburn
—of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. RACKLIFF of Easton
CHAMPAGNE of Fairfield
GAUDREAU of Lewiston
—of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This bill to open a season on Moose in the northern zone is one that has been with us before as you all know, and I feel sure that I need not say too many words in opposition to this bill, and in the protection of these magnificent animals I have shown Moose in Maine movies to a great many of you and I am sure you know how much sport it would be to shoot one of these animals. I will say again that one live Moose for many people to see and shoot with a camera is worth a great deal more to the State of Maine than the

hundreds of these that this bill would eliminate if we had them. We are being told by some that there is a Moose population in this northern zone of one Moose to every 2.2 square miles and I would tell you that during the last two falls I have travelled this very country and I have not seen a track, and I have travelled over a good many hundred square miles.

Now the point that might be brought out is that I think it would be most discriminating against these northern Moose to open a season on them only and let the southern Moose live. I think this was proven with the bear the other day, and I think this is all I need to say. I move to accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, now moves that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Fort Kent, Mr. Bourgoin.

Mr. BOURGOIN: Mr. Speaker, I would very well appreciate that the Minority Report "Ought to pass" be accepted. Of course the motion has been made that the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report be accepted, and I would wish that you would all vote against it.

We have a very big population of Moose up in the northwest border and it has been improved through the hunting of our northern Province north of us that have improved the Moose by harvesting some of them for the last twenty or twenty-five years, and of course they will be harvested, it is only a matter of who will harvest the Moose in the northwestern section, the residents of Maine or the residents of our northwest Province. We had a very good population last fall. I have hunted every year for the last forty-five years and last fall is the first time that I have seen more Moose than I saw Deer, I saw as many as five in one week that could have been shot very easily. If we had a bunch of Americans in that section hunting, it would kind of deter our northern neighbors from hunting the Moose. In the Province northwest of us

in the Zone C, which is practically only second growth woods and not suited to the bringing up of Moose like our virgin forests that we have in that northwest territory, they have shot 260 Moose and I would say eighty to eighty-five per cent of those Moose were born in U.S. and travelled to the Canadian Province or were enticed over there and after being dead hauled over there, and I would certainly like to have the ought to pass report, and it would help our biologists to study the Moose situation the same as they have in New Brunswick for the last seven seasons and they have improved their Moose population immensely by taking out the big Bulls out of the herds.

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

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: It doesn't seem to me that the slaughter of Moose would serve any meaningful purpose to the citizens of Maine. Reports would indicate that the Moose are worth more alive than dead. This gives me an opportunity to tell the members of this House of my experience as a boy when I helped to tie up a Bull Moose. It is rather a fascinating story, but I will not take up your time telling you this story.

L. D. 709 is a bill supported by those whose self interest is rated above that of the public interest. I do not have the bill before me, but I think you will find that the open season on Moose would be September. Now September would be a rather early time for this purpose and if they did shoot the Moose in September there would be a lot of spoiled meat.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Mr. Speaker and Members: I move this be tabled until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Hodgdon, Mr. Williams, now moves that this matter be tabled until Tuesday, May 16 pending the motion of the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, to accept

the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

Mr. Cookson of Glenburn requested a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Tuesday next will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 41 having voted in the affirmative and 72 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did not prevail.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Haynes.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, has a division been requested on the acceptance of the Committee Report?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will order a vote. The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, that the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report on Bill "An Act Providing for Hunting Moose in Certain Portions of Aroostook County for 1967 and 1968," H. P. 496, L. D. 709. All those in favor of the acceptance of the Majority "Ought not to pass" report will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 79 having voted in the affirmative and 37 having voted in the negative, the motion did prevail.

Sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act relating to Wearing Fluorescent Clothing When Hunting in Southwestern Zone for Two Years" (H. P. 671) (L. D. 943) reporting "Ought to pass" as amended by Committee Amendment "A" submitted therewith.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. FARLEY of York
— of the Senate.
Messrs. CHAMPAGNE
of Fairfield
GAUDREAU of Lewiston
LEWIN of Augusta
HAYNES of Camden

THOMPSON of Belfast
 COOKSON of Glenburn
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. ANDERSON of Hancock
 HOFFSES of Knox
 — of the Senate.
 Mr. RACKLIFF of Easton
 — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Gaudreau of Lewiston, the Majority "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. 671, L. D. 943, Bill, "An Act Relating to Wearing Fluorescent Clothing When Hunting in Southwestern Zone for Two Years."

Amend said Bill in the Title by striking out the word "Southwestern" and inserting in place thereof the word 'Southern'

Further amend said Bill in the 5th line (4th line in L. D. 943) by striking out the underlined word "Southwestern" and inserting in place thereof the underlined word 'Southern'

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

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act relating to Reciprocity in Registration of Pharmacists" (H. P. 153) (L. D. 271) reporting a Resolve (H. P. 1157) (L. D. 1654) under title of "Resolve Permitting Thomas D. Smith of Ellsworth to Take Examination for the Practice of Pharmacy" and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. GOOD of Cumberland
 STERN of Penobscot
 — of the Senate.
 Mrs. BAKER of Orrington
 Messrs. SHAW of Chelsea
 CUSHING of Bucksport
 RICHARDSON
 of Stonington

CONLEY of Portland
 BELIVEAU of Rumford
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
 — of the Senate.
 Mrs. WHEELER of Portland
 — of the House.

Reports were read.

On motion of Mr. Beliveau of Rumford, the Majority "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Resolve read once and assigned for second reading the next legislative day.

Divided Report Tabled and Assigned

Majority Report of the Committee on Liquor Control reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Sunday Sale of Liquor" (H. P. 908 (L. D. 1318)

Report was signed by the following members:

Messrs. BECKETT of Washington
 CURTIS of Penobscot
 — of the Senate.
 Messrs. MEISNER
 of Dover-Foxcroft
 KYES of Skowhegan
 HICHENS of Eliot
 SAHAGIAN of Belgrade
 — of the House.

Minority Report of same Committee on same Bill reporting same in a new draft (H. P. 1158) (L. D. 1655) under same title and that it "Ought to pass"

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. BOISVERT
 of Androscoggin
 — of the Senate.
 Messrs. ROY of Winslow
 COTE of Lewiston
 TANGUAY of Lewiston
 — of the House.

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

Mr. HICHENS: Mr. Speaker, I move the Majority Report "Ought not to pass" be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, moves

the House accept the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I request this be tabled until Tuesday, May 16.

Mr. Hichens of Eliot requested a division.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout, moves this matter be tabled until Tuesday, May 16 pending the motion of the gentleman from Eliot, Mr. Hichens, to accept the "Ought not to pass" Report. A vote has been requested. All those in favor of the tabling motion will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

61 having voted in the affirmative and 60 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Divided Report

Majority Report of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought not to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Expenses of Chief Administrative Officer of County Commissioners of Aroostook County" (H. P. 814) (L. D. 1190)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
Mr. COUTURIER
 of Androscoggin
 —of the Senate.
Messrs. SNOWE of Auburn
 NADEAU of Sanford
 ROBERTSON of Brewer
 CROMMETT
 of Millinocket
 —of the House.

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

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. MILLS of Franklin
 —of the Senate.
Messrs. WIGHT of Presque Isle
 FARRINGTON of China
 MEISNER
 of Dover-Foxcroft
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

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

This bill applies only to Aroostook County. It did have at least I will say almost unanimous approval of the Aroostook County Delegation. If you have the bill before you, the amendment to the law says: "except that the Chief Administrative Officer of the Board of County Commissioners of Aroostook County shall receive all necessary expenses to the performance of his official duties including his expenses of travel between the County Seat and his home."

Now Aroostook County is a fairly large county and because of the fact that frequently the Administrative Officer of the Board of County Commissioners is chosen in an area that is somewhat distant from the County Seat, the County Delegation felt that it was just to allow him his traveling expenses as he goes from his home to the County Seat in Houlton, and at the present time the traveling distance is approximately sixty-odd miles.

These are my reasons mainly, and this applies to Aroostook County only and I hope you will go along with the "Ought to pass" Report of the Committee.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker: I would like to have a division on accepting the Minority "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: A vote will be ordered.

Mr. NADEAU: Could I speak on this at this time?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. NADEAU: Yes, well I would like to remind you ladies and gentlemen that this is only the start. If we open this door today, they will all be asking for traveling, and as most of you know, these jobs that these people run

for they knew what it paid before they started and they already do receive certain types of money. This bill would permit them to collect expenses to and from home. Now they are allowed a certain amount of expenses when they go on different jobs. We felt that we would no longer have control of these expenses, and they already are very well paid people. Before our committee we met with delegations from several groups and none of them could assure me or convince me that the pay they are receiving, and I can assure you that there isn't one of these County Commissioners that is making less than \$70.00 a day for his day's work, and if you think that we should give them extra additional travel expenses, then you should vote for it, but I urge and beg you not to.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: As a member of the Committee on Towns and Counties, I signed the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report, and I am not by any means trying to meddle in the affairs of Aroostook County, I merely feel that this is going to be setting a precedent and that they will try to do this in other counties. We figured that if this bill became law that there would be too many abuses. This bill would not limit the expenses of the County Commissioners or the Chief Administrative Officer of the County Commissioners; he would be able to travel back and forth between his office and his home as often as he wanted and he could get paid for it. I am opposed to this and I ask for your support of the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Mr. Speaker, may I add again, ladies and gentlemen of this House, that at no time did any of these County Commissioners were willing to, shall we say, put our cards on the table. Each one had a different verse, a dif-

ferent story, and mind you I can assure you that they already are collecting other unknown benefits. One is namely the meals. They always manage to have this meeting around the noon hour so they collect meal allowances too. Believe me, there is more to this than what this bill shows.

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

Mr. BOURGOIN: Mr. Speaker, we had a couple of meetings, County Delegation meetings with the commissioners and they listened to our problem and we have listened to their problems and I am entirely in accord with Mr. Bragdon of Perham on the matter of Aroostook County.

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

Mr. SNOWE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that these members are elected officials; they know what their expenses—what it is going to cost them and how much they are going to earn when they run for the job and I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, that the House accept the Minority "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Expenses of Chief Administrative Officer of County Commissioners of Aroostook County," H. P. 814, L. D. 1190. 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.

33 having voted in the affirmative and 84 having voted in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, the Majority "Ought not to pass" Report was accepted and sent up for concurrence.

Divided Report

Report "A" of the Committee on Towns and Counties reporting "Ought to pass" on Bill "An Act relating to Enactment of Municipal Zoning" (H. P. 853) (L. D. 1386)

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. COUTURIER
 of Androscoggin
 —of the Senate.
 Messrs. NADEAU of Sanford
 ROBERTSON of Brewer
 MEISNER
 of Dover-Foxcroft
 CROMMETT of Millinocket
 —of the House.

Report "B" of same Committee reporting "Ought not to pass" on same Bill.

Report was signed by the following members:

Mr. MILLS of Franklin
 Mrs. SPROUL of Lincoln
 —of the Senate.
 Messrs. FARRINGTON of China
 WIGHT of Presque Isle
 SNOWE of Auburn
 —of the House.

Reports were read.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the "Ought to pass" Report.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson, moves that the House accept Report "A" or "Ought to pass" Report.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It hurts me deeply this morning to oppose my good friend, Representative Robertson from Brewer, who is a very able gentleman and who I have enjoyed serving with tremendously this session on the Towns and Counties Committee. However, this particular piece of legislation is not consistent with my belief and I will spend just a moment to point out my objections.

It seems to me that if, under this bill, the municipal officers are allowed to change the decision of action of a municipality at their regular meetings, regular conventions, or their special legislative sessions, that this in fact is going against the majority vote of this municipality, and that's exactly what this legislation proposes to do, to allow the municipal officers to alter and change any action

taken by the municipality for the remaining part of that year, or between their legislative sessions. Therefore, on this alone, for this reason alone, I object to this measure and I hope you will vote against the motion. Thank you.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It makes me feel indeed sorry to have found my good friend is in grief this morning in having to oppose my measure. It almost makes me sorry to have to stand up and defend it.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the twelve children that I am going to parade before this House this year. I think they're all healthy, I think that they all bring good tidings, and I want to try to keep them alive and for this reason I would like to state the reasons for this particular piece of legislation.

Now this is what is called commonly as permissive legislation. It would provide Maine citizens and their municipalities with an alternative method of enacting and amending the zoning ordinance.

Now presently in all municipalities a public hearing must be held before the planning board at least ten days prior to the final vote being taken on either an enactment of a zoning ordinance, or an amendment to the ordinance. Now in cities as well as certain towns with municipal charters, the final enactment of a zoning ordinance or an amendment thereto is the responsibility of the municipal officers. Now in towns without a charter the final action is a vote of the Town Meeting itself.

Now L. D. 1386 would permit the Town Meeting if it so desires—and I reiterate—if it so desires, to vest the power of enacting and amending a zoning ordinance with the municipal officers of the town. Now I personally feel that this bill is good permissive legislation. With the increased problems of land use development and blight in our communities, steps certainly

must be taken to control haphazard growth.

Now, zoning in our modern community has become almost a necessity if the community is to have orderly growth and if the rights of the citizens are to be properly protected. In a modern town and city, homes, business and industry each must be laid out in its proper perspective in order that the community may be well balanced without infringement upon the rights of individuals. The bill before you is to make it possible for a community to formulate zoning regulations in an orderly fashion rather than in a disorganized and unorderly fashion.

Now, in effect, instead of trying to enact a zoning ordinance in town meeting, if the meetings authorize the officials to enact a law, and members of this House it is a lot easier for a Board of Selectmen to formulate and discuss the requirements of a community, than it is for all the voters in attendance at a town meeting to try to come to an agreement as to what is needed in a zoning ordinance. In fact, in most communities, it would be impossible to reach a consensus of opinion or to reach any agreement as to what is required in a zoning ordinance, and consequently many of these communities who would like this protection, and in reality need it very badly, could never have the benefits of a zoning regulation.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, this bill is aimed at helping these communities. It isn't going to help my community—we've had zoning for years, I don't know how we could get along without it, but it is going to help these communities that don't have it to solve this problem, but only — and get this—only after the town or city has voted that they want a zoning ordinance. To me it is difficult to visualize that the informed residents of any community would not want to accept the benefits and protection they can derive from a zoning ordinance. However, they have this prerogative of voting it down at election time if they so desire, but for the community who

wants this protection, for the homeowner who needs this protection, the bill before you simplifies the procedure and enables the acceptance of a more effective and beneficial ordinance than would be possible if it was tried to be enacted in a Town Meeting. So ladies and gentlemen of this House, for the benefit of the communities which you represent, I beseech you to vote for the acceptance of Report "A" "Ought to pass." Thank you.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I wish not to belabor this proposition this morning; neither do I wish to compete with the eloquent gentleman from Brewer. However, coming from a small municipality and realizing the possibility of changes of the officers of my municipality and other such municipalities each year, I can see great problems in enacting legislation like this. I simply ask the House not to go along with it this morning. I don't think there are any two municipalities in the State that are exactly alike. Some choose to impose certain ordinances; some choose to have zoning and other measures taken and others do not. I think this is setting up a structure which some municipalities might in good intentions get into and find themselves with a group of municipal officers who do not decide in the best interest of those people, those citizens in that municipality. I hope you won't go along with this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. SUSI: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I have to speak in opposition to this bill. I believe that the experience of the sponsor of this bill has been with a city that has had an exceptionally progressive viewpoint, and I think that they have generally had very progressive municipal officers, and very fortunate in that respect, but I have seen strong evidence that around the state

amongst your Selectmen you are apt to have quite a solid core of opposition to zoning. I am completely in agreement with the idea of zoning, we have it in our community, and it has worked beautifully for us and I pity any community that doesn't have the advantages of it, and as I understand this bill, I just read it for the first time, but it looks to me as though if we vote this through and if at the first Town Meeting that this proposition is put before the townspeople, the authority is given to the municipal officers to amend these zoning regulations of the community, that that power would remain in their hands until it was taken away from them, and it might stay in their hands for a long period of time and deter any efforts made to zone.

I believe that it would do away with the public hearings which under the present law as I understand it, the Planning Board is charged with calling on any change in the present zoning laws and I believe that it would be much too great a concentration of power in the municipal officers hands if you should get a group in municipal office that were opposed to the idea of zoning. I think that it might hold a community back from zoning for many years, and I don't think it warrants the risk. I hope you vote against the bill.

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

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Speaker, coming from an area of small towns, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not rise in support of Mr. Farrington and Mr. Susi. I do hope sincerely that this bill will be killed. I think that it is a very bad bill for small towns.

Mr. Robertson of Brewer was granted permission to speak a third time.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Mr. Speaker, there are only two or three points. I am not going to belabor this issue. I am quite familiar with municipal zoning both from a town viewpoint and from a city viewpoint. I must state that this bill was presented not for the larger cities, it was presented for the

towns at the request of some of these municipalities.

I reiterate, it is permissive; no town has to accept it, this is their own prerogative. I think the opposition to zoning in any community stems from misunderstanding, the inability of those who are in favor of zoning to sell its good points. If you don't do a good selling job on any measure that you have before you, certainly you are not going to sell it, and that has been the problem in these communities that do not have zoning. I can't visualize how zoning can harm any community. Constructive growth can only come by planning, and planning in any community requires zoning in order that a plant or a shack doesn't come up alongside of your \$25,000 home and depreciates its value. We want developments of homes in one area and business in another. It doesn't take away the opportunity for the Town Meetings in each instance, each time they meet, to amend this ordinance.

It is entirely up to you ladies and gentlemen. You know what your communities want. I am not trying to sell something you don't want, but it is my understanding that this is what the majority of the communities did want and this was approved by the Maine Municipal Association and by the Managers of these various towns, and I present it for this reason. I thank you and I will not speak again on the issue.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Brewer, Mr. Robertson, that the House accept Report "A" or "Ought to pass" Report on Bill "An Act relating to Enactment of Municipal Zoning," H. P. 853, L. D. 1386. The Chair will order a vote. As many as are in favor of accepting Report "A" will vote yes and those opposed will vote no, and the Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

56 having voted in the affirmative and 48 having voted in the negative, the "Ought to pass" Report was accepted, the Bill read twice and assigned for third reading the next legislative day.

Order Out of Order

From the Senate: The following Order:

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they adjourn to meet on Monday, May 15, at four o'clock in the afternoon. (S. P. 647)

Came from the Senate read and passed.

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

Passed to Be Engrossed

Bill "An Act Creating the Uniform Rendition of Prisoners as Witnesses in Criminal Proceedings Act (S. P. 546) (L. D. 1394)

Bill "An Act Providing for Re-examination of Accident-Prone Drivers" (S. P. 616) (L. D. 1610)

Bill "An Act Appropriating Funds for Airport at Bar Harbor" (H. P. 50) (L. D. 75)

Bill "An Act relating to Suspensions Ordered by the Hearing Commissioner" (H. P. 269) (L. D. 390)

Bill "An Act relating to Right of Entry and Inspection of Nursing Homes" (H. P. 406) (L. D. 572)

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 Insurance Transactions Through Credit Card Facilities" (H. P. 876) (L. D. 1288)

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

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

Mr. MADDUX: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The gentleman from Hollis, Mr. Harriman, is absent today and as he is interested in this bill I would request that it be tabled until Tuesday, May 16.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Providing for a Tax on Real Estate Transfers" (H. P. 1143) (L. D. 1627)

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

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau.

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker, I move this be tabled until Monday, May 15.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau now moves this matter be tabled until Monday, May 15 pending passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: In light of the importance of this bill—

The SPEAKER: The gentleman cannot debate a tabling motion.

Mr. PENDERGAST: I would request a division.

The SPEAKER: A vote has been requested. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GILL: I wish to debate the time of the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman may debate the time of the tabling motion.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would not be able to go along with the time of this tabling motion because of the date assigned. If the gentleman from Rumford were able to table it until Tuesday, I believe we would be able perhaps to support his motion a little more strongly.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau.

Mr. BELIVEAU: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my motion and make a new one.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau, requests permission to withdraw his motion. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair recognizes the same gentleman.

Mr. BELIVEAU: I now move this item be tabled until Tuesday, May 16.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Rumford, Mr. Beliveau, now moves that this matter be tabled until Tuesday, May 16 pending passage to be engrossed. A vote has been requested on the tabling motion. All those in favor of the tabling motion will vote yes and those opposed will vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken. 67 having voted in the affirmative and 26 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

Third Reader Tabled and Assigned

Bill "An Act Concerning the Practice of Public Accountancy" (H. P. 1153) (L. D. 1649)

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

(On motion of Mr. Minkowsky of Lewiston, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.)

Bill "An Act relating to Funds of Deceased Patients and Inmates" (H. P. 1154) (L. D. 1650)

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

Amended Bills

Bill "An Act relating to Certificates of Organizations of Corporations Filed Prior to January 1, 1966" (S. P. 318) (L. D. 841)

Bill "An Act relating to Amount of Wages Subject to Trustee Process" (S. P. 377) (L. D. 991)

Bill "An Act Providing for Action in Aid to Dependent Children Cases Involving Fraud" (H. P. 672) (L. D. 944)

Bill "An Act relating to Appointment Duties and Tenure of Permanent Chief of Fire Department of City of Westbrook" (H. P. 677) (L. D. 949)

Bill "An Act Creating a New Charter for the Town of Fairfield" (H. P. 848) (L. D. 1262)

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 Amended

Bill "An Act Amending Charter of the City of Hallowell" (H. P. 906) (L. D. 1356)

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

On motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester, the House voted to reconsider its action of May 11 whereby Committee Amendment "A" was adopted.

The same gentleman then offered House Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moved its adoption.

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

HOUSE AMENDMENT "A" to COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to H. P. 906, L. D. 1356, Bill, "An Act Amending Charter of the City of Hallowell."

Amend said Amendment by striking out in the 5th line the underlined figure "10%" and inserting in place thereof the underlined figure '25%'

Further amend said Amendment by striking out all of the last paragraph.

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

Bill "An Act Amending the Portland Renewal Authority Law" (H. P. 907) (L. D. 1317)

Bill "An Act relating to Board of Commissioners of Police for the Town of Sanford" (H. P. 1117) (L. D. 1590)

Resolve to Reimburse Elmer Hannigan of Portland for Property Damage by Highway Construction (H. P. 734) (L. D. 1057)

Were reported by the Committee on Bills in the Third Reading, Bills read the third time, Resolve read the second time, all passed to be engrossed as amended by Commit-

tee Amendment "A" and sent to the Senate.

**Passed to Be Enacted
Emergency Measure**

An Act to Share Costs in School Administrative Districts on a Basis other than State Valuation (S. P. 621) (L. D. 1617)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure and a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 106 voted in favor of same and 3 against, and accordingly the Bill was passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Passed to Be Enacted

An Act to Create a Commission to Prepare a Revision of the Insurance Law (S. P. 326) (L. D. 925)

An Act Establishing a Grievance Procedure and Appeals Board for State Employees (S. P. 383) (L. D. 995)

An Act relating to Transportation of Disabled, Collision Damaged, Wrecked or Repossessed Highway Motor Vehicles (H. P. 59) (L. D. 84)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

An Act relating to Guides Under Fish and Game Laws (H. P. 353) (L. D. 500)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

(On motion of Mr. Jannelle of Scarborough, tabled pending passage to be enacted and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.)

An Act relating to Time Limit of Keeping Sick or Injured Dogs by Agency Boarding Such Dogs (H. P. 602) (L. D. 846)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

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

Mr. McMANN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I beg your pardon for not getting up but I was trying to figure out the amendment, and I would ask somebody on the committee if they could please, bring me up to date on the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Bath, Mr. McMann, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Soulas.

Mr. SOULAS: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: In answer to my colleague of great esteem, the gentleman from Bath, Mr. McMann, we have a new draft on the bill for the boarding of dogs and we have taken and allowed the dogs fourteen days instead of the original draft of seven days. I hope this answers the question.

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

An Act relating to Functions of State Political Conventions (H. P. 681) (L. D. 953)

An Act relating to Special Offices for Indian Tribes (H. P. 747) (L. D. 1094)

An Act Appropriating Funds to Update the Surveys of Penobscot Tribal Lands (H. P. 751) (L. D. 1098)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, passed to be enacted, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

Enactor

Tabled and Assigned

Resolve to Reimburse Marguerite Sophrer of York for Well Damage Resulting from Use of Salt on Route 1 (H. P. 93) (L. D. 121)

Was reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed.

(On motion of Mrs. Fuller of York, tabled pending final passage and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.)

Finally Passed

Resolve to Reimburse L. D. Durgin, of Limington, for Well Damage Resulting from Highway Construction (H. P. 401) (L. D. 567)

Resolve to Reimburse Enzly Nason of Linneus for Well Damage by Highway Maintenance (H. P. 1051) (L. D. 1523)

Were reported by the Committee on Engrossed Bills as truly and strictly engrossed, finally passed, 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 Education on Bill “An Act Providing an Education Loan Fund for the Higher Education of Teachers” (H. P. 626) (L. D. 882)

Tabled—May 2, by Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport.

Pending—Acceptance.

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: L. D. 882 is “An Act Providing an Education Loan Fund for the Higher Education of Teachers. It could substantially reduce the critical teacher shortage.

Notwithstanding the steady growth of the state colleges, and their repeated raising of enrollment goals in order to bridge Maine’s “teacher gap”, this gap still exists. A survey made in the spring of 1966, showed that of 558 elementary teacher vacancies the previous fall only 320 were filled by graduates of Maine colleges, and that of 436 secondary and special area vacancies, only 227 were filled by qualified graduates of Maine colleges.

If you will recall, in August 1966, the school superintendents reported 525 teaching positions vacant. But by October 1, all but 54 of these positions were filled — some by teachers holding conditional certificates and some substitute certificates.

For weeks now, as we get into the spring, the departmental placement office has received requests for from 3 to 12 teachers a day.

New schools opening often need 15 to 20 new teachers. The present shortage is most critical in the elementary schools. In secondary schools there is a shortage in the fields of English, mathematics, science and French, as well as in special education fields of physical education for girls, librarians, guidance, and vocal music.

Some of the reasons for the serious shortage of teachers can be attributed to the following factors:

1. The increase in retirements, 275 in 1964 and 432 in 1965.

2. Increase in specialized programs, caused by Federal monies becoming available. These programs take the classroom teacher away from her original assignment.

3. Maine is considered an exporting state in the teacher market. Two reasons for leaving are:

A. Better salaries in other states;

B. More graduate study facilities in other states.

4. 1966-67 full time teaching positions in Maine are 10,488.

1965-66 full time teaching positions in Maine were 9,674.

An increase in teaching positions in the next year of 1966-67 are 814.

The colleges are planning a variety of measures to help to close the “teachers gap”: A “crash program” for women physical education teachers, enlarged extension and evening college preparatory programs, more summer session courses, more graduate courses, a Master of Arts in teaching program, and far from least, an accelerated increase in regular enrollments, and I would point out to you that 46 percent of the elementary teachers of this State are over 50 years of age.

This teacher education loan fund bill would enable the colleges to make a substantial step toward the new enrollment goal by expanding enrollments in the next two years and getting more young people interested in the teaching field. One of the features of this piece of legislation is that a deserving young person can apply for three \$500 loans to help them through the last three years of college, which are usually the most difficult years financially. Now, if this person will stay and teach in our

state system for five years, these loans would be forgiven.

I have talked to members of the Education Committee and they realize that the educational loan document they favor is in the form of a Constitutional resolve which requires a two-thirds vote of both Branches and the perils of ratification by the people this coming November and could not be used to grant loans till mid-term 1967-1968. On the other hand, my measure, if accepted and passed with a reasonable sum of money, could be in operation educating deserving young people this fall of 1967.

I respectfully request that this House support me in my effort to keep this measure alive.

Mr. Speaker, I now move to substitute the bill for the report and respectfully request that the House support me in my effort. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Kennebunkport, Mr. Pendergast, now moves that the House substitute the Bill for the Report. The Chair will order a vote. All those in favor of substituting the Bill for the "Ought not to pass" Report will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

On motion of Mr. Shute of Farmington, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport, to substitute the Bill for the Report, and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

Bill "An Act Increasing Minimum Wages" (S. P. 48) (L. D. 38) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-68))

Tabled—May 9, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

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

Mr. EWER: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Rockland, Mr. Huber, has two amendments which he wishes to present, and since he is not present today, I would hope

that someone would table this until Tuesday, May 16.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Birt of East Millinocket, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

An Act Prohibiting Hauling Lobster Pots on Sundays (H. P. 240) (L. D. 348)

Tabled—May 9, by Mr. Quinn of Bangor.

Pending—Passage to be enacted.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: On a previous occasion when this matter was before us, I discussed the natural rights of the citizens of our State to fish in the waters of the State and hunt game in its forests, and that those fish and that game was the property of the State to be taken by the citizens of this State if and when they desire. The Supreme Court of Maine has held that that is so, in the case of the State versus Snowman, and they further have held that the State in its collective sovereign capacity may permit or prohibit the taking thereof, and when such taking is permitted, the Legislature may impose such limitations, restrictions and regulations as it deems necessary for the public welfare. This Legislature should not restrict or abridge the right of its citizens to fish on Sunday for lobsters. Now I previously and today have spoken considering the general right of all the citizens. I am now going to add to those certain lobster fishermen who desire to fish for lobsters on Sunday, and apparently are not with the group that is supporting this particular bill.

Many of our good citizens in the summertime who live in the cities and towns of the inland, like to bring their families to the coast. They like to lease summer property; others own summer property, they bring their families and

children there for the benefits that the coast has to offer to them, among which is the right to fish lobsters. Many of these people work hard during the week and Saturday afternoon and Sunday, until their vacation period, are the only periods during the week that these people can go to the coast and be with their families and with their sons go out and set a few lobster traps for the edification of the sons and for the sport of getting a few lobsters. Would you take from these people that privilege and that right? If you pass this bill, you will.

I have been told, and you have heard, that about 200 fishermen, commercial fishermen, came before the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee supporting this bill, very enthusiastically. They did it as a conservative measure. But conserving for whom? Do they want to conserve for themselves? Do they want a priority over the right to take lobsters? Was it self-fish? Is this measure a selfish measure? If it is, certainly this Legislature should not support it. Many of those people who appeared before this Committee are large operators, men of means, men of money, who can afford to give up a day or two and come down here and try to put this bill across. What about the poor little fellow that has a limited number of traps and a large family to support who wasn't here? I have heard from him since, and many of you have. He wants to fish on Sunday.

Now this bill restricts the time of fishing as follows: "That during June, July and August of each year it is unlawful for any person to raise, haul, or transfer from the tidal waters of this State any pot, trap, or other contrivance that is set for the taking of lobsters or crabs during the period from 4:00 p.m. United States daylight savings time," mind you, that is 3:00 p.m. standard time, "on Saturday, to sunrise on the following Monday." If you pass this act nobody would be able to haul any of these traps from the middle of Saturday afternoon until sunrise on the following Monday, under any circumstances, because it would be

the law of the land, and as a statutory provision must be enforced strictly.

Since we last discussed this matter, it has been brought to my attention, that there are many lobstermen in various areas of the State that have protested this bill. Many of the commercial fishermen who fish these lobsters, because of religious reasons, observe their Sabbath on Saturday. There are a large number of these folks on the coast, particularly the Seven Day Adventists. A sturdy honest, God-fearing group of people that do not fish on Saturday. Would you, as a Legislature of the State, say to these people that observe their religion on Saturday as the Sabbath, you cannot fish on Sunday by law, therefore you are going to lose two days of fishing? If you pass this bill, you will do just that thing. Now on the coast of our State, there are not all wealthy commercial fishermen. There are hundreds of our citizens who make their livelihood by commercial fishing that can only afford to have a limited amount of equipment, a limited amount of traps, and who have large families and in order to support those families, they have to work seven days a week. They need the income from seven days labor to support their families and send their children to school for an education. Are you going to take one of the days away from them so their income will be that much less? These people that are industrious and want to work, are you going to take the right away from them? We should encourage industry. We should not restrict it.

Much of our stormy weather comes in cycles of six or seven days, frequently coming on the weekend. Are these poor fishermen that are limited in their investment in their number of traps going to be told that if a storm comes on Saturday and spreads over into Sunday, they can't go out and haul their traps and save their equipment? If you pass this law, they can't. They will lose their investment.

Now the game wardens have no authority to give anyone permission to break the law. They must

conform to this law if you make it a law. And they cannot give anyone permission to pull traps because of a storm. Now many of the fishermen that I referred to before, have contacted by letter and phone many of you members of this House. I know some of our members down in the area of Bath and Woolwich have been approached, and the fishermen in their areas have stated, "We police our traps down there and in order to do that we've got to be out there every day in the week among them and if you do not allow us to haul our traps on Sunday, from the middle of Saturday afternoon, it's going to cost us a lot of money. We need the privilege of fishing during this period, with those folks that are out there protecting our property."

Some of the commercial fishermen from Casco Bay have contacted many of you folks, and protested taking away from them the right to operate on Sunday. There are other folks that have brought to my attention this situation, many of them are engaged during the week in inland areas in regular employment and Saturday and Sunday they go to their homes on the coast and set out a few traps to catch a few lobsters to supplement their income, they say, "Don't take the privilege away from us, we need that little income." They can't fish through the week because of their regular employment and because of the fact they work away from the coast. There are many of those.

I was given a clipping from the Portland Press Herald of May the 11th. "Sunday Vital to Maine's Commercial Fishermen" is the title. It is addressed to the editor of the Press Herald. "As the spouse of a commercial lobster fisherman, I agree that they lead a hard, dangerous life, and deserve every break, but barring Sunday fishing just makes an additional hardship to many of them. By mutual agreement, many fishing communities stay ashore en masse on Sundays, but what consideration is given to the offshore fisherman who because of tides and chop cannot fish on the days that inshore lee of land traps can be hauled. Weather seems to occur

in cycles. Sundays are sometimes the only no-blow days. If it is a religious law, it is unconstitutional. If it is meant to bar non-commercial trappers, then it also leaves the ocean wide open to pleasure boat pirates who will now have thousands of unattended traps to tempt them. One does not legislate when a farmer shall make hay, his livelihood depends on the whims of the weather: so does that of the deep sea commercial lobster fisherman.

Hauling lobster traps on Sunday should be a personal prerogative, suited to the conditions, and not decided by city fellas and Aroostook potato farmers." Signed, Marge Cook, Chairman, Knox County Marine Fisheries Extension.

So, my friends, all of the lobster fishermen are not for this bill. The poor lobster fisherman, the little fella, doesn't want this bill. Therefore, I move that L. D. No. 348 be indefinitely postponed, and I hope you will support me in it.

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

Mr. PRINCE: I hate very much to belabor this lobster Sunday bill again. We had a long debate on it and it was reported out of the Committee as you know 9 to 1 "Ought to pass." It had its readings in the two Chambers and is back to us here for enactment.

I find it difficult to argue with people who will not accept the truth and facts as to why a natural resource that represents an industry should have protection through conservation methods. It has always seemed mysterious to me why some Legislators will argue against a measure such as this that doesn't ask for any money, simply asking for protection of a \$15,000,000 industry. I have noticed time and time again Legislators voting against this type of legislation, making it very controversial and still, on the other hand, voting for a \$30,000 study and a million dollar bill without batting an eye.

I represent two coastal towns, Harpswell and Yarmouth. Many of my constituents are fishermen, and I mean fishermen, I don't mean these pot augers that screw

an outboard motor on a skiff and run around with only ten or fifteen traps, I mean beam trawlers and draggers and seiners, whose investments run from 50 to 75 thousand dollars. Picture, if you can, a cove with a hundred boats, seventy-five boats, fifty fishing-craft boats. If you multiply the number of boats by eight or ten thousand dollars, it would give you a brief idea as to the value of boats that the fishermen operate with on the coast of Maine, and you can understand that they pay a very large tax into the State of Maine.

Now the good gentleman from Bangor, Representative Quinn, speaks as though the Atlantic Ocean had an inexhaustible supply of lobsters, and that this is depriving the rights of people of our State. This is a conservation measure, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I have in front of me here a book of the Sea and Shore Fisheries laws showing some of the areas that have had to be closed along the coast of Maine in years gone by. Because why, because lobsters were scarce, and they had to close the areas. Monhegan Island presently is closed, or at least it is closed from June first until January first. There have been closed times on Pigeon Hill Bay. There have been closed times in the towns of Cutler, Trescott. There have been closed times in Harrington, Milbridge, Steuben, Gouldsboro, closed times in Criehaven and on, showing that the Department of Fisheries and the Legislature had to make regulations to protect the lobster industry.

I'm not going to make any lengthy talk on this at all. I'm all finished. But again, I would like to remind the Members of the House that an editorial that appeared in the Portland paper was on the side of the fishermen. And I also would like to remind the Members of the House that this little book that has been presented to us, The Maine Marine Institute, on page three it makes mention the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries has established a definite co-relation between water temperature and lobster growth and abundance. For the past nine

years, the total poundage of lobsters landed per year in Maine has steadily declined. Concurrently, there has been a steady drop in the temperature of Maine ocean water. Sea water temperatures in Maine are predicted to grow even colder during the next twenty years, indicating a further and even drastic decline in the total supply of lobsters. I mention this only to remind you that this is another reason why we should conserve what we already have, and I hope that this House will enact this bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I'd like to take exception to the conservation measure aspect of this bill. Those traps are out there during Sunday, when the trap is out and baited it is fishing. The only way that this is a conservative measure is that it eliminates the small guy that does go on his outboard motor to make a few extra bucks. It eliminates him from the picture entirely. Closed areas, if they have had to close areas in the past that's fine I go along with that—but it's closed to everybody. When the season is opened again, everybody can fish again. It's not discriminatory.

Now this bill came out "Ought to pass." I was at the hearing myself—it was crowded, and ninety per cent of the members were from the Maine Lobstermen's Association. Well, I thought that the Maine Lobstermen's Association represented the majority of lobster fishermen upon the coast, but I made inquiries. As a matter of fact, they represent only two counties with a membership of around three hundred; there are six thousand lobster licenses issued in the State of Maine each year.

Now the off-shore haulers inform me that these small boats were negligible in the theft of lobsters, because a string of traps of from six to ten on one string, they defy any city slicker grabbing hold of that line and hauling traps to any great extent—you have to be a tough, seasoned man to do it

by hand, and very few do pull traps at the present time by hand.

Another thing is the high seas; they inform me that previous to a storm—a big storm—and after a big storm, due to the high run of seas, the off-shore lobsterman has all he can do to save his traps, and if three days are taken during the week to save his traps, then he's got to work the weekend to haul those traps and rebait, so I go along with the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill and all its accompanying papers.

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

Mr. HEALY: Mr. Speakers and Members of the House: In the few remarks that I have opposing this bill, I would hope I am more persuasive than I was in the early part of the week; on another matter, the roof fell in on me, and I'm still licking the wounds!

However, I have heard from home too. Fact is, I have a bundle of letters here, I have been besieged with phone calls from lobster fishermen who make their livelihood and support their family in fishing for lobsters, and they need Sunday to haul their lobster pots. A couple of these letters are addressed: "Dear Congressman," and for that alone I would be an ingrate if I didn't offer some opposition to this bill.

In the previous debate on this affair the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince, suggested that our visitors were pirates. I think that was a gratuitous remark to the people who contribute so measurably to the economy of the State of Maine. Furthermore, I recall he said that the summer visitors drive the police force of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department crazy. I think that the thing that would drive them crazy is the ten months they don't have anything to do!

Now insofar as this being a conservation measure, I recall talking to Commissioner Green sometime ago, and incidentally, it was prior to the time I'd ever heard of this restriction of fishing—of pulling lobster pots on Sunday. They told me that the production of lobsters had considerable to do

with the temperature of the waters—it develops in cycles apparently.

Now, I don't think really that our visitors steal these lobsters from these traps to any great extent. They probably wouldn't lose a thousand pounds—if they did that.

I recall some years ago where the sardine packers made the great hue and cry over taking the herring from the waters to have it restrictive — the herring were taken, however, for the so-called "grinders". They ground the fish for fish-meal that was used for, say to some extent in poultry feed. And I wish they had never discovered that was a protein for the pushing of poultry, because every time I eat a chicken now I think I'm eating a gull! And that didn't hold water—there's been thousands and thousands and thousands of hogsheads of fish taken from the water, herring taken from the water for grinders, and the sardine packers can get all* the fish they want for their sardines.

Now I think perhaps I have said enough here, but I would hope that you ladies and gentlemen would be concerned and considerate of the lobster fishermen who depend on these hours from Saturday afternoon to Sunday morning to fish their traps, to make their livelihood, to support their families. I therefore hope that you support the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn's, motion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Camden, Mr. Haynes.

Mr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I represent two coastal towns on Penobscot Bay. The professional full-time lobstermen in that area contacted me last Sunday and asked me to speak in opposition to closing the Sunday fishing.

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

Mr. BRENNAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have received more mail on this bill than any other measures. These letters have unanimously expressed the

view that this bill should be defeated.

The gist of these letters which come from people who identify themselves as lobstermen is that if they are prevented from fishing on Sunday they will be unable to make a living for their families. I suggest that we enable them to make a living.

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

Mr. PENDERGAST: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of L. D. 348.

The last three Legislatures have not passed legislation which would conserve the lobster population. I believe this measure is a start in this direction. The past Legislatures have discussed, one—limiting the number of lobster traps, and this seemed to be unenforceable. Number two, limiting the number of licenses—this seemed to be unconstitutional. Three—the number of fishing days—this wasn't acceptable.

Now I would like to point out that we have Sunday laws against merchants staying open; Sunday hunting. We're not allowed to go into barrooms and taverns, et cetera.

Now I see this bill as reasonable and enforceable and I urge you to vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone.

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

Mrs. BOUDREAU: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I don't propose to be an authority on lobster fishing, and I certainly didn't intend to speak on this issue, but after the mail I have received opposing this I felt that I must. Of course my place of employment is close to the waterfront, so possibly I've been a logical target.

Now most of the fishermen do some business with us, so they've really been giving me the business.

They oppose this legislation because as they say, they have only a few months of the year to earn their complete livelihood. Many of them are trying to put children through college and the sons are working with the fathers during

these months and they feel the loss of Sunday would mean a great deal to them.

Also, the Northern New England Conference of Seven Day Adventists have their main office in Portland—also customers of ours—and these people represent a large group, and they are very opposed to this.

Now, since I want to go home I must urge you to go along with Mr. Quinn.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley.

Mr. DUDLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Well I'd like to say a few words to this House as a real landlubber. However, I do go to the coast and I am one of those men that has to have a lobster license—I don't have one yet this year, but I still have five lobster traps; and not too many years ago I used to go to the coast and catch a few legal size lobsters. I hoped that I wouldn't have to say so in this House, but I'm real honest with myself so I will say that lately I've only caught short lobsters, so that's all I've been able to boil in the kettle. And I know a lot of my colleagues that go from up where I live, and it's quite a ways from the coast, are having the same trouble—and they do like lobsters and they don't throw many back, and I think the people on the coast are right when they say they've got to do something about conservation. Now they've been good enough to us. Up where I live I can remember back further than I wish to remind you, but I can actually remember when we had three months' open season on deer. These people have gone along with us so next year it's going to be thirty days.

I want to say too, I don't think anybody has called to your attention that I can remember when the season along the coast of Maine saw fit to have three months of closed season, June, July and August, for three consecutive years. Now I'm afraid, I still want to go down there and try and catch some lobsters—but I'm afraid if we don't do something in the line of conservation that we'll have to go back to a

closed season for June, July and August, and I won't be able to catch any at all. Now, I can go down and fish on Friday night and Saturday. A lot of the people that I fish with work in the paper mill and they work three to eleven, they go in at three Monday afternoon and are able to pull their traps again Monday morning, so we're not being deprived altogether, we can still fish and get enough I think for a mess or two and maybe a few pounds to bring home, so I wouldn't say that they were depriving us altogether, but I'm afraid if we don't take some step to conserve these short lobsters—that's all I can seem to catch, of course I'm such a landlubber that I don't dare to go outside, I have to fish in sight of the land you understand, but of most of the landlubbers that I know from the area that I come are all the same they're just the same as I am, they're a little timid, they get out of sight of land, and so they catch the same type of lobster that I've been catching, and I really believe that it's wrong and if we continue to do this, and I must say that as long as the others continue to do it I probably will, that it's wrong and eventually I'm afraid that we'll be stuck altogether, and I in closing would like to urge you to vote against the motion to indefinitely postpone because I see the danger of not being able to catch any lobsters in a few years, and I would like in closing to pose a question through the Chair, if anyone from the coast would care to tell us about the regulations on the island of Monhegan. I understand they now have had quite a closed season, I'd like to have some of the House enlighten us on what they're doing down there on conservation.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Enfield, Mr. Dudley, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I cannot speak with too much knowledge

about the rules and regulations around Monhegan, probably someone else can, but it is my understanding that they close their own shorelines for six months out of the year. If this is true, and if they are as successful in the lobster industry as I understand they are, then I think this might be an excellent idea. However, I wouldn't want to propose it for the entire coast.

It is generally agreed that this is a lobster conservation measure. There are those who would disagree with me, but in general the full-time lobster fishermen do agree that this is a conservation measure. It is for this very reason that I sponsored this measure for the Maine Lobstermen's Association.

There have been several objections registered here in opposition to the bill, one of which was the fact that we might have a serious windstorm and the lobster fisherman would want to tend to his traps on Sunday. In contacting the Weather Bureau and the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department, I find that there has been one windstorm during the months of June, July and August since 1954 that would be of concern to the lobster fisherman—one, so I don't think that this is a valid argument.

We come to the part-time lobster fisherman who wishes to participate only on weekends. I have said before that if this person wants to participate in the lobster industry on a part-time basis, then I feel that he must do so by abiding by the rules and regulations that are in the best interests of the lobster industry.

Now I have just checked, about fifteen minutes ago, with the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department about the pounds of lobsters landed in the State of Maine or on the Maine coast, and the number of lobster traps fished. In 1963, there were 731,000 lobster traps fished on the coast of Maine; there were 22,804,000 pounds of lobsters landed. In 1965, there were 789,000 lobster traps fished, a considerable increase; there were 18,861,000 pounds of lobsters landed. This means a considerable increase in the number of lobster traps

fished, a considerable decrease in the number of pounds of lobsters landed.

To me, this spells trouble. I have said before, and I stick to it, the lobster industry in the State of Maine is in trouble. Now, we have heard about the small lobster fisherman who feels that he must fish on Sunday. I don't want anyone to think that I don't have compassion for the person who feels that he must fish on Sunday, but I feel that we must preserve the lobster industry for this small person to fish in. This is my only concern. I am not directly associated with the lobster industry. I live in an area that is very prominent in it, however. We have several gentlemen in the House who are directly associated with the lobster industry, and I might call your attention to the roll call vote that we had on this measure on acceptance of the 9 to 1 report of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Committee. If you would check that roll call vote you would find that almost every Representative coming from a coastal area where there is a considerable amount of lobster fishing activity you would probably find that they were voting for this bill.

Now, this to my way of thinking is merely a matter of the full-time lobster fisherman asking us to make a rule or a regulation which is in the best interest of the industry in which he is participating, and I ask you ladies and gentlemen to allow these people to regulate their industry to this extent at least, and it is not unanimous by any means that they agree with this measure, but when you can get 8 to 1 to a committee hearing saying that they are in favor of it, I must say to you that this is a very, very good ratio for lobster fishermen. They don't agree on many things, but I am very much convinced that they are in agreement on this one. I ask you to vote against the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, to indefinitely postpone this bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I rise in support of L. D. 348.

The commercial lobstermen are entitled to the modest protection that will be provided them in Representative Benson's bill. I for one support the basic ideas and views of my dear friend, Representative Benson.

The past two weeks I've spent considerable time along the coast having in the course of events the opportunity to speak to many commercial lobstermen on this Sunday bill. 90 per cent of them assured me they had the fullest confidence in this bill as presented. 5 per cent were undecided, and about 5 percent made no comments to me one way or another.

Scientific information is now being collected on lobster research which will involve a sampling plan using statistical projections to determine the size composition of the commercial lobster fishery and, further, to determine the catch per unit of effort. Data on size and sex composition will enable scientists to make estimates on the survival and mortality of lobsters. These and other estimates will be calculated by computer. The results will serve as a basis for recommendations for increasing the yield of the total lobster catch.

Another phase of the lobster research program will involve studying the effect of heated sea water on survival and growth of lobsters. This information will lead to important findings in learning how to increase the supply of lobsters under controlled conditions.

The findings of the Legislative Lobster Study Committee, which was created and funded by the 102nd Legislature, among its recommendations: The industry recognizes the increase in fishing effort and feels, with present knowledge of the present resource, that any increase in fishing effort could not be economically justified. The industry, in fact, recommended limiting fishing efforts and that consideration be given to a limit on fishing time.

This Legislature should consider, first, the full-time lobster fishermen with his investment. Lobsters,

being the direct livelihood of hundreds of Maine citizens, should not be legislated into the hands of the non-commercial weekend fishermen until such quantities are in the excess of commercial demands. Gathering of scientific information will prove out many yet unanswered questions. However, in the meantime, this bill will aid an industry that now is in trouble. It is our duty to support these lobstermen and their families by supporting a bill that will benefit the industry.

Comments were made earlier regarding Sunday fishing, is there any difference in hunting on Sunday? A comment was made that most of the storms occur on weekends. Our finest weather comes to us during the summer months here in Maine. I know, I go diving year-round. Something was mentioned about people who worship on Saturday. The Jewish population worships on Saturday, yet in many cases they are denied to open their stores on Sunday.

Last night I spent about two hours over at Mt. Washington, Channel 8, TV, filming an interview, and after the editing is done part of that interview will make a news release for the first time concerning the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department's expanded program on underwater research, and this research will aid the lobster industry greatly. Yesterday a lawyer asked me, he says: "you of all persons, a skin diver, how can you back this bill to aid the lobstermen?" My mother once told me that I should forgive, but never forget. Back in '63 I was one of four skin divers that was shot at, supposedly by a lobsterman who was outraged with our diving near his pots. I feel that it would be a sign of ignorance to carry a grudge forever, and we have forgiven this gentleman and resolved the issue, but I feel that we must support this bill to help them out. Thank you.

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

Mr. MADDOX: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When I came here this morning I thought I had only one concern, or one item

to be concerned about — this particular bill. Since then, I find I should very definitely be concerned about another item.

I live in an area, and represent an area, that has one of the largest concentrations of lobster fishermen in the State. Seven of my towns are actively engaged in lobster fishing, and I am their Representative, and I haven't a written protest from any one of them against this bill. Now that, to me that's significant. It also makes me concerned about my particular position as their Representative.

So, I ask you ladies and gentlemen, because in my opinion this is a good bill, to defeat the motion to indefinitely postpone before the lobster capitol of Maine moves from Rockland to Bangor.

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

Mr. CROMMETT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I do not know anything about the lobster fishing, and you might wonder why living where I do why I would speak on this measure. I live in the town of Millinocket, the gateway to Mt. Katahdin, surrounded by fresh water fishing lakes, but I have to rely on someone in regards to the lobster fishing, and I will go along with my friend, the gentleman from Harpswell, Mr. Prince, in his judgment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waldoboro, Mr. Waltz.

Mr. WALTZ: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: The lobster fishing population in my district is not large, but since this bill was passed to be engrossed here in the House some few days ago, I believe that every one of these fishermen have contacted me protesting against this bill.

I don't think that they are motivated entirely by the loss of one day of fishing as they are about concern about the possible loss of their fishing gear and equipment. They feel that with a severe storm coming up on the weekend, and with an unusual run of high tides which would cause their buoy lines to be buried in kelp and eelgrass, that if they had to wait an extra day or two to get out there to

check their traps that their loss might be considerable.

When this bill was presented here, or rather voted upon on a roll call vote, I voted in support of this bill. Today, I suspect a roll call will be taken again, and I am going to vote against the bill.

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

Mr. ROSS: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: A lobster bill gives me a chance to correct a statement that was made yesterday, and stand up for commercial lobster fishermen. My friend and neighbor from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey, tried to berate my statue. He said that we should have a typical, rugged "Down Easter" and not a man down on his knees playing with a lobster. My man is an actual typical rugged State of Mainer, it's a realistic action pose. He is down on one knee with a lobster in one hand pegging a claw with the other. If my friend from Woolwich would like to play on the floor with a good sized lobster which had not been pegged, good luck to him.

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

Mr. BERNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the sentiments given to us earlier by Representative Dudley. I have a question that perhaps some of you should ask yourselves in your minds. I spent considerable time down on the coast mostly in the shallow waters, and the question is this: why is it that the weekend campowner down there that has a few traps and pulls them, presumably eats the lobster right there at his cottage, why does he persist in throwing back off the end of his pier the shells and remains of the short lobsters? They accumulate on the bottom and it makes an awful mess.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Scarborough, Mr. Jannelle.

Mr. JANNELLE: Mr. Speaker, after receiving many letters from the lobster fishermen from Fal-mouth through Scarborough and Old Orchard Beach, I rise to support the motion to indefinitely

postpone. A large majority are definitely against this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. MINKOWSKY: Mr. Speaker and Honorable Members of this Body: I am going to be brief and right to the point. I cannot significantly add anything of additional value to my good friend's remarks, Mr. Quinn of Bangor, Maine, except that I have had numerous inquiries from constituents in my area and their statements to me fully concur with those expressed by Representative Quinn.

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

Mr. HARVEY: In regards to the statement by Representative Ross of Bath, I stand corrected, and Representative Ross, I was corrected last night by another member too, so I apologize.

But getting back to the bill, after all the speeches and the tears have flowed and sopped up their crying towels and so on and so forth, it all boils down to one hard fact, and that is, this is not a conservation measure, and I will debate anyone on it at any time. It is merely a bill to put the small man out of business. Now this is not true conservation. True conservation would be Mr. Dudley for instance and his short lobsters. I'll make it a point that the Sea and Shore Fisheries check the length of his lobsters next summer. If he wants to do something about it, he can; he can throw those short lobsters back where they belong to grow for another year, and he can tell his buddies to do the same thing. Now that might grow and grow and grow until all these shorts are thrown back where they are supposed to be, and if he can't catch a big one, he can go buy one like I do.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we don't have lobsters up our way, but I just talked to my friend and neighbor, Mr. Dudley, and he tells me he is going to change

his ways and obey the law from now on.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Machias, Mr. Watts.

Mr. WATTS: Mr. Speaker, Members of this House, and Congressman: I just want to impress on all of you people that as far as I am concerned and the people in my area, the lobster fish is a commercial item and not a plaything for the idle summer visitor. I do not have much sympathy for the people who go down on the coast who own property that costs from around fourteen to a hundred dollars a foot frontage that have to set lobster traps to buy a few prestige lobsters.

We have in our area a boat club consisting of thirty members who most of them have boats and we spend our time in Machias Bay, and none of us have traps. We figure that we can buy our lobsters from our commercial fishermen and support our industry. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. LOWERY: Mr. Speaker, I think at this time I have been the ranking member of the Sea and Shore Fisheries Department in the House. I have been here for ten years. I have seen many things in the lobster industry; I have watched it. I have seen efforts made to curb the industry by improper legislation. I do not agree with Mr. Quinn. I know that he is a pretty smart lawyer, but I do know that I will follow the report of the Sea and Shores Fisheries and I thank you very much.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing privilege more or less on this matter, and I can't help but think that my good friend from Brunswick, Brother Lowery, gave a very good talk on privilege when he was referring to the seiners yesterday because that was for a privilege too.

My good friend Dave Benson from Southwest Harbor, his heart bleeds for the poor fisherman who is going to lose one day of fishing

because the law says he can't fish on Sunday. He is going to lose a fraction more than that, because he can't fish after the middle of Saturday afternoon; but how about the poor fisherman that because of his religious scruples doesn't fish on Saturday, now he can't fish on Sunday, so he loses two days, is that going to affect his economy at all? And my good friend Brother Prince from Harpswell can't understand why anybody will get up and argue about bills that aren't money bills. There is some principle to this bill, and anyone that will sit and not argue on a matter of principle, a matter of liberty, a matter of rights, that's what this bill amounts to.

But I want to refer to something else that hasn't been referred to here, and you fellows that want to conserve lobster fishing, you think it over. This bill reads in this manner: "During June, July and August of each year, it is unlawful for any person to raise, haul or transfer from the tidal waters of this State" — what? "Any pot, trap or other contrivance that is set forth taking lobsters for crabs." Where is the skindiver? The skindiver has the whole field to himself. He isn't pulling any pots. He isn't pulling any traps, but he has got a field where there are a lot of traps and there is no one out tending them.

Now if you pass this bill everyone that owns those traps has got to go out and police them. Now do they want to go out and police them without pulling a few traps and making it worth their while? This is a bad bill. I hope you will go along with me on its indefinite postponement.

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

Mr. PRINCE: Mr. Speaker, just a few words to remind the members of the House and ask yourself this question: whom do you consider—whose judgment would you consider to be the better of the two, the men who do the lobster fishing, the men of the Department that represents the industry and the people that live on the shore that are familiar with this thing,

or someone that lives in the highlands? I ask you that.

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

Mr. BENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think we have talked about lobsters and lobster fishing about enough. I would like to make just one observation as the result of the remarks of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn. The skindiver is already regulated by the law as you know. He can go swimming all he wishes on Sunday, but he cannot take those luscious little lobsters.

I would like for those of you who are not associated with lobster fishermen and live in an inland area to note that such people as the gentleman from Stonington, Mr. Richardson, the gentleman from Vinalhaven, Mr. Maddox, the gentleman from Machias, Mr. Watts, the gentleman from Gouldsboro, Mr. Bunker, the gentleman from Bristol, Mr. Lewis, and others, I will not attempt to name them all, these people are representing lobster fishermen and lobster fishing industries. These people are the people that I would think you might turn to for advice in this matter, and I hope that you will. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. McMANN: I don't know where Mr. Quinn gets the idea this isn't a money bill. Maybe he doesn't buy many lobsters. I don't fish 'em but I buy 'em and when you have to pay \$1.40 a pound wholesale, I agree with him, it's a money bill.

The SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that "An Act Prohibiting Hauling Lobster Pots on Sundays," House Paper 240, L. D. 348 be indefinitely postponed. The Chair will order a vote.

Mr. Harvey of Woolwich requested a roll call.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been requested. For the Chair to order a roll call it must have the expressed desire of one fifth of those present and voting. All

of 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, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that L. D. 348 be indefinitely postponed. All of those in favor of indefinite postponement will vote yes, those opposed will vote no and the Chair opens the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA—Allen, Baker, E. B.; Bellevue, Binnette, Boudreau, Brennan, Brown, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Champagne, Conley, Cookson, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Crockett, Curran, Drigotas, Eustis, Farrington, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Hall, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harvey, Haynes, Healy, Henley, Hodgkins, Hunter, Jalbert, Jameson, Janelle, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Lycette, Martin, Miliano, Minkowsky, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Porter, Quimby, Quinn, Robertson, Scribner, Snow, P. J.; Soulas, Starbird, Tanguay, Townsend, Waltz, Wheeler, Wight, Wood.

NAY—Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Benson, Berman, Bernard, Birt, Bradstreet, Bragdon, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Clark, Crommett, Crosby, Cushing, Darey, Dickinson, Drummond, Dudley, Dunn, Durgin, Evans, Ewer, Fuller, Giroux, Hennessey, Hewes, Hichens, Hinds, Hoover, Humphrey, Immonen, Jewell, Lincoln, Littlefield, Lowery, Maddox, McMann, McNally, Meisner, Mosher, Nadeau, N. L.; Payson, Pendergast, Philbrook, Pike, Prince, Rackliff, Richardson, H. L.; Rideout, Robinson, Rocheleau, Ross, Sahagian, Sawyer, Scott, C. F.; Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Shute, Snowe, P.; Susi, Thompson, Trask, Truman, Watts, White, Williams.

ABSENT—Belanger, Bourgoin, Couture, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dennett, Edwards, Hanson, B. B.; Harnois, Harriman, Hawes, Huber,

Kyes, Noyes, Richardson, G. A.; Roy, Sullivan.

Yes, 66; No, 67; Absent, 17.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will announce the vote. Sixty-six having voted in the affirmative and sixty-seven having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

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

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

An Act Revising Names of Bureaus in Department of Agriculture (H. P. 698) (L. D. 979) In Senate, passed to be engrossed;

Tabled—May 9, by Mr. Bragdon of Perham.

Pending—Motion of Mr. Hanson of Solon to indefinitely postpone.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I will be very brief in my remarks this morning. This bill has been passed in the other body to be engrossed and the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, who tabled this bill has checked on this bill and is now satisfied that it is okay, and the former Deputy Commissioner who worked in the Agricultural Department for many years has no objections to this bill. He is now retired. So I hope the motion of the gentleman from Solon does not prevail.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: This is one of those difficult times. I had lunch with the Commissioner of Agriculture yesterday and the day before and he didn't seek to persuade me not to oppose this measure. I have known the Commissioner for a long time, he was Master in the Grange while I was Master in the North Somerset Grange and I have a great deal of respect for him as an individual.

I still can't feel in my own mind, however, that I can condone the action here. I don't feel that this is in the best interests of good

government. Now I'm not debating the merits of the proposal so much as I am the manner by which it has been approached. There are some areas of question in the merits, however, and I think I should point them out. That when the Commissioner explained this proposal to the Agricultural Committee at our first executive session, he did indicate that it would save the State money. I have contacted the Office of the Personnel Department and they have assured me that they would not make a flat commitment that this would cost more, that in their experience over the years that this actually would cost more. Governmental agencies have a habit of growing like Topsy.

Another statement that the Commissioner did make at our executive session was that the two individuals presently charged with the responsibility of these activities within the Department of Agriculture were doing a very, very good job, that they had been able to do without the Division of Chief of Services for a considerable length of time. I can appreciate the fact that you might want to reward a man for doing a good job, I would suggest that possibly you might promote him; but I don't feel necessarily that you would have to create an entirely new division to do this. There is an opening within the current division of the Division of Markets — there isn't any in the current division yet.

I would further suggest that where they have been able to get along for an extended period of time and where by the Commissioner's own statement this job has been done very very well and adequately, that it would not work considerable hardship to postpone action on this until another legislative session, where it perhaps could be presented in a more proper manner. It might even be that this would be one of those real opportunities that we might have to eliminate a job that actually has been proven unnecessary. This part is the Commissioner's own statement.

As I say, it's difficult to oppose somebody that you have respect for, but I still have firm convictions as to propriety, the proper manner by which things should be done, and I still must go along with my motion to indefinitely postpone. Thank you.

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 really quite simple, I have worked with it all winter long. All that the Department wants to do is just change a couple of names over so that they will be in keeping with other departments around the country, and the Division of Markets they want to call the Division of Agricultural Promotion because we have goods that we sell on the world's markets and over half the cost of running the Agriculture Department, which is a million dollars a year, is for consumer protection, and that's what we want to call it—consumer protection.

You know we protect the consumer like going around testing scales, truck scales or apothecary shop scales and things like that, and inspecting things and when you buy a dozen of eggs you know every egg in that carton weighs exactly twenty-four ounces; and if you had a piece of blueberry pie for your supper last night you know that there wasn't any maggots in it. So when you go into a store to buy a pound of beefsteak you know it's beef and not horse-meat. And they assured me it won't cost no more money and there won't be anybody else working for the Department. So I urge you to vote against the motion of my friend Mr. Hanson.

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

Mr. SCRIBNER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I have also discussed this particular L. D. with the Commissioner of Agriculture. He has assured me he believes in the long run it will make it possible for him to save the State a few thousand dollars.

I would like to point out my experience with the budgets presented by the various departments. The Department of Agriculture is the only department in the state government that operates more than one division in which the costs I feel are reasonably properly allocated so that you can tell the cost of performing any certain function within any one of these divisions.

They claimed, for example, under this proposed change that there is a Division of Inspection over the Division of Agricultural Promotion. If someone is interested in how much it costs to promote our agricultural products, the records of the Department of Agriculture will indicate fairly accurately what this cost really is without having to make a great number of adjustments. If the Commissioner of Agriculture feels that he should change some of these names in order for administrative efficiency I feel that based on his past performance in properly allocating these costs that we should go along with it and encourage effectiveness of this type of budgetary allocation. Thank you.

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

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for Representative Hunter and I don't question his judgement too often, but I must confess—I used to sell eggs and I have yet to find a dozen of eggs that each egg only weighed twenty-four ounces. I mean the entire dozen weighs twenty-four ounces, but not each egg.

One thing that I would like to bring out, or two points that I would like to bring out is that there are over the country and in Maine fewer and fewer people engaged in agriculture, and yet not too long ago I read an article which indicated that the Department of Agriculture on the Federal level was second highest in gaining new employees. They seemed to hire—the fewer farmers you have the more people you have to have to administer their department.

Another point that I would like to make is that we just recently voted favorably on a bill to allow producers of milk to tax themselves an additional cent a hundredweight to promote their product, and I believe potato growers have a self imposed tax. Many many of the different agricultural industries do tax themselves and conduct their own promotional programs. Now these are separate and distinct from the Department of Agriculture. I don't know just how much value or benefit we derive from the activities of the Department's promotion. I do know that most major segments of Agriculture do have their separate and distinct promotional agencies.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey and I wish that the question would have come up previous to my making my remarks.

The SPEAKER: As many as are in favor of indefinite postponement of An Act Revising Names of Bureaus in Department of Agriculture, House Paper 698, L. D. 979, will answer yes; those opposed will answer no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion did not prevail.

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

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

Resolve Permitting R. Dean Sequin of South Paris to Take the Examination for Admission to Practice Law (H. P. 514) (L. D. 727) (In House, passed to be engrossed) (In Senate, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence)

Tabled—May 9, by Mr. Richardson of Cumberland.

Pending—Further consideration.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Houlton, Mr. Berman.

Mr. BERMAN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Further drafting on this particular matter is in progress in the office of Mr.

Slosberg and I am certain that the drafting should be completed by Tuesday next. Therefore I hope that someone would table this matter for two legislative days.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Hewes of Cape Elizabeth, tabled pending further consideration and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

SENATE REPORT—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on State Government on Bill "An Act relating to Certain Expenses of Supreme Judicial Court Paid by State to Cumberland County" (S. P. 207) (L. D. 546)

(In Senate, Bill substituted for Report and Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Senate Amendment "A" (S-85)

Tabled—May 10, by Mr. Dennett of Kittery.

Pending—Acceptance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout.

Mr. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Dennett, the House chairman of the State Government Committee being absent today, he has asked me to act in his stead and on behalf of the State Government Committee and move that we concur with the Senate. Therefore I so move for concurrence.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Manchester, Mr. Rideout, that the House concur with the Senate in substituting the Bill for the Report.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Mr. Dennett, the gentleman from Kittery, our chairman, is in concurrence I believe with the amendment. I believe it was the feeling of most of the State Government Committee at the time that we discussed this matter that the bill should come out "ought not to pass" in its entirety. It was the feeling of some of us, probably

myself in particular, that we saw no reason for the Supreme Court of this state meeting in Portland at all, and therefore why should it not be removed to Augusta, the seat of Government? The United States Supreme Court does not meet in two places, so why should the State Supreme Court?

There are persons currently who are in favor of the amendment, however, and our good chairman in particular, so I would ask that someone would table this item until he can be here to explain his views.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Humphrey of Augusta, tabled pending the motion of Mr. Rideout of Manchester that the House concur with the Senate in substituting the Bill for the Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

Bill "An Act relating to Credit for Military Service Under State Retirement Law" (S. P. 277) (L. D. 657) (In Senate, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-96)

Tabled — May 10, by Mr. Pendergast of Kennebunkport.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Norway, Mr. Henley.

Mr. HENLEY: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I am sorry to have to delay these things, but this bill here I am particularly interested in and I am in the midst of a little bit of research on it and I am awaiting some reports. So I would wish that someone would table it until Tuesday next.

Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Ross of Bath, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

HOUSE REPORT — Ought Not to Pass — Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing for Pensions

for Widows of Former Governors" (H. P. 1050) (L. D. 1522)

Tabled — May 10, by Mr. Humphrey of Augusta.

Pending — Motion of Mr. Quinn of Bangor to substitute Bill for Report.

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

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: First I want to thank the gentleman from Augusta, Mr. Humphrey, for tabling the matter until today, in order that I might say a few words on the subject, the subject matter of which can't be debated very severely.

It has been my privilege over the years to know quite a few of the past Governors and also their gracious ladies. It has been my privilege to be entertained at the Blaine House when they were hostess, and during the terms of their husbands they met not only the citizens of Maine but the general public, people from outside the state, and entertained in behalf of the State of Maine. And it wasn't until recently that I discovered that these gracious ladies were forgotten insofar as retirement benefits might be provided for them. I know and realize that the Justices of the Superior and Supreme Court of the State of Maine, their widows are well provided for by law.

I realize that in many instances the Executive Officer, the Governor of our State, is a man of means, is a man of wealth, and the chances are that his widow will be well provided for. But that is not always true. There are times when our Governors are not men of wealth; there are times when there are limited means; and consequently the widow they leave behind them is a person of limited means.

It is my feeling that we didn't want to have any of these fine ladies find themselves in a position where the means of living were difficult to them because of their financial condition, and I felt that an arrangement should be made whereby some little sum of money should be made available to them

in case they needed it. I didn't feel that it should be given to them outright, but I did feel that if they applied for it they would not apply for it unless they needed it, and if they applied for it we ought to make it available to them.

Now I know that our Appropriations Committee has been considering this for a long period of time and some have suggested that possibly I should put an amendment on the bill, and state that in the case the income of these fine ladies was less than a stipulated amount then they would qualify for some help from the State of Maine. I don't feel that that should be done to these fine people. I think we should make available to them a reasonable sum of money in the event they needed it and upon their application, and that is the reason I brought the matter up and that is the reason I sponsored this bill.

Now I feel that I have informed you of my feelings; I don't know what yours are. If you feel the same way I do you will make it possible in case that some of these fine ladies may need to apply for this money it will be made available to them. I thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, that the House substitute the Bill for the Report.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I made a statement at the time this bill was reported out of the committee and I do not intend at this time to elaborate on that statement. The Appropriations Committee gave this document most thorough consideration and the bill as it is now before you was not acceptable to the Committee. They tried to come up with a redraft or an amendment that might seem to them fair and reasonable. At the time the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, asked that this bill be held, he suggested that he would attempt to come up with such an amendment. I would wonder if he has encountered the same difficulties that the Appropriations

Committee did in trying to do this. At least he has not presented us with such an amendment, or any amendment on which we could act upon at this time.

I believed your Committee tried sincerely to try to be fair to all concerned in their report on this bill. I still hope that you will accept the unanimous report "ought not to pass" of that committee.

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

Mr. JALBERT: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: It certainly is not my intention to take issue with the able House chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon. And I have had, as he knows and several members of the Committee—as all the other members of the Committee has, serious thoughts concerning this measure, and what the gentleman from Perham says is absolutely true. By the same token what the gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, says is absolutely true. You find yourselves sometimes in the position of really and truly wanting to do the right thing.

And I also want to reemphasize the fact that the Committee deliberated hard and long on this thing. But this harks me back to the days of many many years ago, many years ago, when I was walking up the street during the legislative session and I ran across the widow of one of our Superior Court Judges. She had a bundle in her arms, and I was talking with her on the sidewalk and she said to me,—“By the way, if you want to buy a nice apple pie sometime,”—and these are absolute facts and I know that some members of this body were here then and know this to be a fact, “why don't you call me up?” I went then to a gentleman in the other branch who was in a position to do something and I brought this message to his attention. So that the next day we prepared legislation, which incidentally has brought about the beginning of pensions for widows of our deceased Superior Court Justices.

And as I state, I am in the awkward position of having been one

who turned out this report "ought to pass." The gentleman from Bangor, Mr. Quinn, suggested a possible amendment. He says by the same token he doesn't know whether we could put this in. It seems to me that somewhere along the line something could be worked out. I do find that one of our Governors' widows is in dire straits; I know also that possibly some others are certainly not. I just feel that these—that I would place these people in their special categories, the widows of judges who have given up a great deal of their lives, their influence, and particularly in this particular circumstance I thought possibly there must be something some way that we could come up with something that could be palatable all the way round.

And for that reason—and again I reiterate, not taking issue with the chairman, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is on the motion of the gentleman from Lewiston, Mr. Jalbert, that this matter be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs. Is this the pleasure of the House?

The motion prevailed. Sent up for concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Granting Complimentary Fishing Licenses for Certain Maine Residents in Armed Forces" (H. P. 1120) (L. D. 1592) (House Amendment "A" (H-237))

Tabled—May 10, by Mr. Dudley of Enfield.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: We in the Fish and Game Committee turned this bill out unanimous "ought to pass" in its original form. I was not in the House the other day when this amendment was put on

and passed, and I am very much opposed to it and I would at this time ask that we reconsider our action whereby this amendment was passed the other day.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, moves that the rules be suspended for the purpose of reconsideration. Is this the pleasure of the House? Is there objection?

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

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, I request a division.

The SPEAKER: A division has been requested on suspending the rules. Those in favor of suspending the rules will vote yes; those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

The SPEAKER: Seventy-six having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one in the negative, seventy-six being more than two thirds, the rules are suspended.

Thereupon, on further motion of Mr. Cookson of Glenburn, the House voted to reconsider its action whereby on May 10 House Amendment "A" was adopted.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: When we put this bill out we put it out under one condition, as a committee, and that was that all the people of the State of Maine should pay for these free fishing licenses, which would be given to our servicemen. Since this time this amendment was put on and I can assure you that we as a committee would not be in favor of it. If it is not on there—if it loses, I would move for the indefinite postponement of this whole bill.

The SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the adoption of House Amendment "A."

Mr. CARRIER of Westbrook: Mr. Speaker, Amendment "A" already—

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: I wish to speak against the motion for reconsideration.

The SPEAKER: The matter is already reconsidered. The pending question is the adoption of House Amendment "A."

Mr. CARRIER: I'm a little confused here. We accepted amendment "A" before, is that right?

The SPEAKER: That is correct. The House just reconsidered its action whereby it did adopt House Amendment "A" and the pending question now is, shall the House adopt House Amendment "A"?

Mr. CARRIER: I really don't know where I am.

The SPEAKER: Is the gentleman in favor of House Amendment "A"?

Mr. CARRIER: Yes, I am.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may speak in favor of House Amendment "A."

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: The original bill, I was the sponsor of the Bill, L. D. 308 which came out in new draft as L. D. 1592. I would like to speak on the merits of the bill and later on if I have to, the procedures that were used subsequent to public hearing which brought about this bill in its new draft which I am against.

The bill provides to give complimentary fishing licenses to Maine residents in the Armed Forces who are on leave or furlough. It also states that the license period would be of two weeks duration or less with two weeks being the limit of the license.

As I and other proponents of the bill stated at a public hearing that as a matter of recognition and gratitude to the service men and women who give the best years of their lives in the service so we can live in security, we feel that at least we could give them a license to fish free of charge.

In this session, as I've noticed before, by joint resolutions, speeches and applause, we have recognized publicly these same boys who have either come back from hostilities or who are subject to take part in it in the near future. I think this was a very commendable and proper procedure on our part.

However, I don't think this is enough. To convince them of our concern for their welfare, I think

it would be proper to allow them to fish, free of charge, for a few days when they are on furlough, if they so desire.

The Inland Fisheries Department and others apparently do not believe in this concept. As a result and proof, let's take a look at the New Draft.

This jewel of a draft, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the new draft 1592, calls to limit fishing to two weeks in one calendar year. The last two lines of the draft calls for a reimbursement from the General Fund to the Inland Fisheries Department. In other words, they want to collect \$3.75 for a two week period in one calendar year, while you or I when we buy a license and pay \$3.75 at least have the privilege of fishing all year.

Getting down to figures, if the cost of a fishing license would be prorated, as I suggested for example, we would, in fact, be telling the service man "We won't give you a \$3.75 fishing license, but give us 16 cents for two weeks and we'll sell you a license to fish for two weeks. This is a joke, embarrassing and extremely crude to the servicemen if we as Legislators approve this new draft as is.

The Inland Fisheries Department also wants money as stated before to be taken out of the General Fund for loss of revenue. In order to claim such loss and for such loss to be sustained, it can only be done so by proof, and cannot be anticipatory.

The department at this time cannot prove such loss. I think that this might not be an illegal clause, but they know that they cannot claim this, they were informed of it, and even though they know about it, they still do it.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel that you can recognize a principle of human decency that's involved, and grant these members of the Armed Forces whom we recognized publicly before, and rightly so, a chance to fish for a few days, which could be their last time. I hope not.

Therefore, I will stop here, and unless I'm forced later on, I will expose the procedures which I think were very unethical, unjust and unfair to the proponents of this bill subsequent to the public hearing when at that time there was no opposition whatsoever. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, as you all know probably, this amendment puts the responsibility of the full cost of these complimentary licenses solely on the shoulders of the Fish and Game Department. We in the committee felt that if the people of the State of Maine want to give our servicemen a free fishing license, they should all like to contribute to it. Therefore, we feel it should come out of the general fund, and this is the only reason that we put it out as such. There are approximately 20,000 in the service and you figure it at \$3.50 each it is \$70,000; take even half of it, that is \$35,000 it is costing the department. We sold 13,000 less fishing licenses, resident fishing licenses last year than we did the year before and we sold 1700 less resident fishing licenses than we did last year, and we sold 858 big game non-resident licenses than we did the year before at \$30.00 apiece, so you can see the loss that the department has been taking, and this would be just another blow, so for this reason, I would move for the indefinite postponement of this amendment, thereby putting the cost of these free licenses onto the people of the State of Maine who I am sure will want to give them to them, we are not against this at all, but we do not feel that the few people who buy the licenses should pay the whole thing. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The pending question now is the motion of the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Gill.

Mr. GILL: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: I rise to oppose the indefinite postponement of this amendment and to support the position of Representative Carrier from Westbrook. It would seem that if we are to extend this privilege, the department itself should be the one to bear the adjustment. We must also keep in mind I believe that the Commissioner of the Department has seen fit to ask for a pay raise of \$5,000 per year, and I certainly feel that we should take this into consideration at the time we are considering this proposed amendment.

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

Mr. STARBIRD: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: You will remember the last session, those of you who were here, we went through practically the same type of thing and the same type of arguments were offered in regard to granting complimentary fishing licenses to those persons who were over seventy years. This was opposed by the Fish and Game Department, but it did eventually go through. Now, those persons over seventy years of age may get the complimentary licenses.

At the same time it galled me to no end that the Fish and Game Department although it opposed complimentary licenses for persons over seventy, a year ago last summer could almost the minute that Arthur Godfrey landed in this state for a day, offer him a complimentary license. If he wished to fish in the State of Maine, I think he is perfectly able to pay for his license.

I will go along with the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier, on this, because I believe these servicemen are fully entitled to it. I might add one thing, that since the price of the Fish and Game licenses were raised last year, might not that be a factor in the less revenue, because they cost more, people buy less, and I think the same thing will happen if we raise them again this year, for I understand there is a bill in to do just that. I support very

heartily the gentleman from Westbrook.

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

Mr. NADEAU: Having been before this Committee, I can assure you that this Commissioner is the biggest lobbyist that we have in this House, and I mean this sincerely; and in reference, it is true, I was there to oppose this \$5,000 pay raise, and I dare the members of this committee to say that he did not state in fact that they are proposing new increases in hunting and fishing, and he even made the mention mind you that the increase may not be necessary unless his pay increase was met with favorable action and here we are debating on something for the veterans which would not cost them sixteen cents. I would like to remind you people that we should support this amendment and support our veterans, and they are only going to be getting a free fishing license during the duration while they are home on leave, and I don't feel that one man, and it is a department head, can come along and tag a price tag to everything there is and believe me I have had to deal with this because I know what he did to my bills.

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

Mr. LEVESQUE: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson of the estimated 20,000 servicemen, has it been figured how many of them would be projected to be on furlough in the State of Maine during the fishing season?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Madawaska, Mr. Levesque, poses a question through the Chair to the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, who may answer if he chooses and the Chair recognizes that gentleman.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen: No, to my knowledge there has been no projection and I would doubt perhaps if there would be any great amount at one time, but over the

period of the years that could well be, it could be twenty-five or thirty percent; that would bring it up to fifteen to twenty thousand dollars loss.

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

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: These boys are over there risking their lives. I think each one of us here are willing to pay this sixteen cents. So I move that we accept Mr. Carrier's amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. BRAGDON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: Again I find myself getting into fish and game matters. I hope that if we are sincere in that we wish to give this privilege to the veterans that you do not kill this amendment, because in reading the revised act which is now before me I note that you do, as has already been stated here in debate, you do propose that they might come out of the General Fund rather than the Fish and Game Fund.

During my long association with the House, I have found that General Fund people have been very reluctant to allow their funds to seep in to other funds dedicated, such as Fish and Game fund. I feel that if you sincerely believe in this bill you should kill the amendment because if it should survive with the amendment killed, and even if you pass it here I have grave misgivings in the wee small hours of the last days of the session whether it would still survive.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier.

Mr. CARRIER: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House: I wish to recognize the remarks of the gentleman from Perham, Mr. Bragdon, but this is one of the things, this is one of—it is apparent to me that this is one of the tactics used by the Inland Fisheries in order to kill this bill. In other words, when we had a public hearing they had told me before when I presented the bill they wanted me to amend that bill, to

take it out of that General Fund. And I did not agree to it, and I told them so in plain words that I would not amend it to take it out of their General Fund, knowing real well or at least assuming that if it ever got to the Appropriations table that it will be killed.

Now I still feel the same way and this is why I wanted to take part of the new draft out; in other words, bring the bill to its original context. Now it has been mentioned about cost. Well to show you another thing about cost or about some of the unfair tactics that I call used by the Inland Fisheries Department, when they first contacted me and the only time because they did not get such a good reception, the cost quoted to me was probably a loss of \$20,000. Since then I was informed, and I have no proof of this, but I was informed that they went to the Committee and said that it would cost \$30,000. Yesterday I talked with another member of the Committee and he tells me that he was informed that it would cost \$70,000.

So just how far can they go and how endless are these tactics that they use in order to get what they want? At the public hearing, as the sponsor of the bill, we had proponents that spoke in favor of it, and I say again there was no opponents to the bill. However, a faithful delegation of the Inland Fisheries was there and they did not have the guts or the gall to get up and speak against this bill and face the proponents of the bill. Now ladies and gentlemen, I thought I was a graduate from the school of hard knocks until I saw the subsequent proceedings on this bill.

I will now give you, if you want to, a few facts and I'm not hiding behind the immunity granted us in this House because I told these facts to the one in authority before, and when subsequent to the hearing, the Inland Fisheries delegation were allowed to attend the executive meeting and objected strenuously to this bill and amended it to death by this new draft, the way I see it, I objected to such a procedure, to be in-

formed that they can do, whoever is in authority can do whatever they want at any time. So therefore I was precluded and so were the proponents to attend or rebut anything which they said. I think that this is very unfair procedure. I think that the heads of departments or their constituents should be here and be forced to talk at public hearings and not be heard behind closed doors if they're going to talk against the bill.

Subsequent to this by trying to come to somewhat of a compromise, no one having been told that it would come not in a new draft but with an amendment on, and objecting to it strenuously, I asked that the bill would be brought in here as ought not to pass, because I didn't want that type of amendment as it stands right now. I do not question the decision of the Committee as a whole, because later I talked with three different members of the Committee who did not know or were not aware that such an amendment was being put on the bill, or if they knew they did not know the whole context of it.

Above all, I have been sitting on this bill for the last week having it been tabled three times and I thought that I would cool off when it came time to speak in favor of it. But I have not been able, and I don't think I will be able, to digest the procedures that were used and I surely do not intend to be a pawn to any department or others to satisfy their whims or desires. I noted recently, a week ago or a few weeks ago that some gentleman in the House got up and he was a little shook up, noticing that most of the committee reports were not accepted, the majority report. Well I think this is one which should not have been accepted and that is why I put the amendment on, not to change the original bill but just to bring it back to original context. So ladies and gentlemen of the House, members of the Armed Forces, and mothers and fathers and their brothers and sisters, and the clubs, different clubs, veterans' clubs, rod and gun clubs, today are looking forward to who's for who and what's for what. Mr.

Speaker, when the vote is taken, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson.

Mr. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise just one more time to assure the members of this House as Chairman of the Fish and Game Committee that it is my duty to stand up and take up for the Fish and Game Department, and when something like this comes up, I do feel that it is the responsibility of the citizens of the State of Maine to give our veterans or our members of the armed forces this much courtesy; not one of us in the Fish and Game Committee are opposed to this bill whatsoever, but we do feel that the cost should be carried by the people, all of the people of the State of Maine. I just want to make this clear in behalf of the Committee, because some insinuations here have been that we as a committee are not for giving them the free license; we are for that, but let's let the people pay for it, let's give the people the privilege to pay for it who I am sure want to. I see no reason at all why the general fund can't stand this burden better than the Fish and Game Department

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Waterville, Mr. Carey.

Mr. CAREY: Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman from Westbrook, Mr. Carrier, and this is important enough a matter that I think the people back home should know how we all stand on this, and for this reason, I ask for a roll call.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Easton, Mr. Rackliff.

Mr. RACKLIFF: Mr. Speaker, I also concur with Mr. Cookson, and I am also in favor of this bill. I also consider myself very patriotic, enough so that I would be willing to pay my share of the cost of these free Fish and Game licenses.

I notice we are all very much in favor of giving these things as long as they don't cost us anything. I am in favor of giving them

even if it comes out of my own pocket. I call that patriotism.

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

Mr. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question through the Chair to anyone who would care to answer. This money has been bandied around here how much is this going to cost. I would like to know how many fishing licenses were sold to members of the Armed Forces last year home on leave.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Woolwich, Mr. Harvey, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

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

Mr. BINNETTE: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with quite some degree of interest to these matters relative to Fish and Game and it seems as though that every time we have a bill come up that pertains to the Fish and Game we have more discussion, more irritations and more dissatisfaction than any other department in the State, and I think that this gentleman from Westbrook has done a remarkably good job trying to get our boys a little bit of consideration, that's the least we could do for them, and when the statement was made by the Chairman of the Fish and Game that we had 20,000 here, I would like to know how many boys are in service from the State of Maine at the present time, and I pose that as a question.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Old Town, Mr. Binnette, poses a question through the Chair to any member who may answer if they choose.

Is the House ready for the question? The pending question is the motion of the gentleman from Glenburn, Mr. Cookson, that House Amendment "A" to Bill "An Act Granting Complimentary Fishing Licenses for Certain Maine Residents in Armed Forces," House Paper 1120, L. D. 1592. A roll call has been requested. All those desiring a roll call will vote yes, those opposed to a roll call will

vote no and the Chair will open the vote.

A vote of the House was taken, and more than one fifth of the members present having expressed a desire for a roll call, a roll call was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The pending question is the motion of Mr. Cookson of Glenburn that House Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed. Those in favor of the indefinite postponement of House Amendment "A" will vote yes, those opposed will vote no, and the Chair will open the vote.

ROLL CALL

YEA — Birt, Champagne, Cookson, Crockett, Durgin, Eustis, Farrington, Hall, Haynes, Hichens, Hodgkins, Hoover, Meisner, Pendergast, Pike, Quimby, Rackliff, Richardson, H. L.; Scott, C. F.; Shute, Snowe, P. J.; Thompson.

NAY — Allen, Baker, E. B.; Baker, R. E.; Bedard, Beliveau, Bernard, Binnette, Boudreau, Bradstreet, Bragdon, Brennan, Brown, Buck, Bunker, Burnham, Carey, Carrier, Carroll, Carswell, Clark, Conley, Cornell, Cote, Cottrell, Curran, Darey, Drigotas, Drummond, Dunn, Edwards, Evans, Ewer, Fecteau, Fortier, Foster, Fraser, Fuller, Gaudreau, Gauthier, Gill, Hanson, H. L.; Hanson, P. K.; Harvey, Henley, Hennessey, Hewes, Hinds, Humphrey, Hunter, Immonen, Jalbert, Jameson, Keyte, Kilroy, Lebel, Levesque, Lewin, Lewis, Littlefield, Lowery, Martin, McMann, McNally, Minkowsky, Mosher, Nadeau, J. F. R.; Nadeau, N. L.; Philbrook, Porter, Prince, Quinn, Rideout, Robertson, Robinson, Rocheleau, Ross, Sawyer, Scott, G. W.; Shaw, Snowe, P.; Soulas, Starbird, Susi, Tanguay, Trask, Truman, Waltz, Watts, Wheeler, White, Wight, Wood.

ABSENT — Belanger, Benson, Berman, Bourgoin, Couture, Crommett, Crosby, Cushing, D'Alfonso, Danton, Dennett, Dickinson, Dudley, Giroux, Hanson, B. B.; Harnois, Harriman, Hawes, Healy, Huber, Jannelle, Jewell, Kyes, Lincoln, Lycette, Maddox, Miliano, Noyes, Payson, Richardson, G. A.;

Roy, Sahagian, Scribner, Sullivan, Townsend, Williams.

Yes, 22; No, 92; Absent, 36.

The SPEAKER: Twenty-two having voted in the affirmative and ninety-two having voted in the negative, the motion does not prevail.

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

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

Bill "An Act relating to the Computation of Secondary School Tuition" (H. P. 979) (L. D. 1421) Committee Amendment "A" (H-260)

Tabled—May 10, by Mr. Richardson of Stonington.

Pending — Passage to be engrossed.

On motion of Mr. Shute of Farmington, retabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

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

HOUSE REPORT—Ought Not to Pass—Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill "An Act Providing Funds for Relocating of Maine Central Railroad Tracks in Livermore Falls" (H. P. 822) (L. D. 1230)

Tabled—May 10, by Mr. Darey of Livermore Falls.

Pending—Acceptance.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Darey.

Mr. DAREY: Mr. Speaker, may this item be tabled until Tuesday next, May 16?

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Livermore Falls, Mr. Darey, now moves that item 2, L. D. 1230, be tabled until Tuesday, May 16, pending acceptance. Is this the pleasure of the House?

Mr. Birt of East Millinocket then asked for a division on the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER: All those in favor of this matter being tabled until Tuesday next will vote yes;

those opposed will vote no. The Chair opens the vote.

A vote of the House was taken.

64 having voted in the affirmative and 36 having voted in the negative, the tabling motion did prevail.

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

HOUSE MAJORITY REPORT
(6)—Ought to pass—Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill “An Act relating to Charging Fees for Services to Persons Acting as Subjects for Student Instruction and Train-

ing in Beauty Schools” (H. P. 611) (L. D. 854) and **MINORITY REPORT** (4)—Ought Not to Pass.

Tabled—May 10, by Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel.

Pending—Acceptance of either Report.

On motion of Mrs. Lincoln of Bethel retabled pending acceptance of either Report and specially assigned for Tuesday, May 16.

On motion of Mr. Richardson of Cumberland,

Adjourned until Monday, May 15, at four o'clock in the afternoon.