

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Sixth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1953

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

Sent down for concurrence.

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

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

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

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

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

The motion to reconsider engrossment prevailed.

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

Thereupon, Senate Amendment A was adopted without reading and the bill as amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence. Sent down for concurrence.

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

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

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