

# 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-Hundredth Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

MAY 12 - JUNE 17, 1961

and

SPECIAL SESSION

NOV. 27 - DEC. 2, 1961

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

**SENATE**

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Douglas H. Robbins of Augusta.

On motion by Mr. Cyr of Aroostook, Journal of Friday was Read and Approved.

**Papers from the House  
Non-concurrent matters**

Bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation for Injuries Under workmen's Compensation Law." (H. P. 937) (L. D. 1285)

In House, May 10, Passed to be Engrossed, As Amended by House Amendment "A" (Filing No. H-254)

In Senate, May 11, Indefinitely Postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted and asked for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, that Body voted to adhere.

Bill, "An Act Requiring Persons Seventy-five Years of Age to Take Examination for Motor Vehicle Driver's License." (S. P. 387) (L. D. 1197)

In Senate, May 9, Passed to be Engrossed, As Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing No. S-64) and by Senate Amendment "B" (Filing No. S-173)

Comes from the House Indefinitely Postponed, in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Stilphen of Knox, the Senate voted to insist on its former action and ask for a Committee of Conference; the President appointed as Senate members of such committee, Senators: Cole of Waldo; Gilbert of Kennebec and Stilphen of Knox.

**House Committee Reports**

The Committee of Conference on disagreeing action on Resolve, Authorizing Study of Road from Allagash Plantation to the Canadian Border. (H. P. 746) (L. D. 1032) reported that the same are Unable to Agree.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence.

**Ought to Pass**

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Continuing the Committee on Aging." (H. P. 1116) (L. D. 1538)

Reported that the same Ought to pass.

Comes from the House, Passed to be Engrossed, As Amended by House Amendment "B" (Filing No. H-288)

In Senate, Report Accepted in concurrence, House Amendment "B" read and adopted in concurrence and the Bill, as amended read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Ought to Pass—As Amended**

The Committee on Judiciary on recommitted Bill, "An Act to Revise the Civil Defense and Public Safety Council Law." (H. P. 811) (L. D. 1126) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (No. H-281)

Report read and accepted in concurrence, and the Bill read once. Committee Amendment "A" read and adopted in concurrence, and the Bill, As Amended tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Ought to Pass—New Draft**

The Committee on Industrial and Recreational Development on Resolve, Authorizing State Highway Commission to Study Desirability of a Bridge Across Taunton River. (H. P. 747) (L. D. 1033) reported that the same Ought to Pass in New Draft under title of: Resolve, Authorizing Bureau of Public Improvements to Study Desirability of a Dam Across Taunton River. (H. P. 1158) (L. D. 1598)

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence and the Bill in New Draft read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Majority—Ought to Pass**

**Minority—Ought Not to Pass**

The Majority of the Committee on Education on Bill, "An Act to Create a School Administrative District in the Town of Fort Fairfield." (H. P. 471) (L. D. 671) re-

ported that the same Ought to pass.

(Signed)  
Senators:  
BATES of Penobscot  
BROOKS of Cumberland  
Representatives:  
HANSON of Lebanon  
HICHBORN of Medford  
DURGIN of Raymond  
LEVESQUE  
of Madawaska

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

(Signed)  
Senator:  
SAMPSON  
of Somerset

Representatives:  
ESTEY of Portland  
CURTIS of Bowdoinham  
SIROIS of Rumford

In House, Majority Ought to pass report read and accepted.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Bates of Penobscot, the Majority Ought to pass report was accepted in concurrence, the bill read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

**Majority—Ought to Pass As Amended by Committee Amendment "A"**

**Minority—Ought Not to Pass**

The Majority of the Committee on Transportation on recommitted Bill, "An Act Relating to Weight Tolerance for Motor Vehicles Carrying Firewood, Pulpwood, Logs or Bolts." (H. P. 861) (L. D. 1175) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A" (Filing No. H-283)

(Signed)  
Senator:  
STILPHEN of Knox

Representatives:  
WHITNEY of Winn  
DUNN of Poland  
FINLEY of Washington  
BERRY of Portland  
BUSSIERE of Lewiston

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject mat-

ter reported that the same Ought not to pass.

(Signed)  
Senators:  
COLE of Waldo  
GILBERT of Kennebec  
Representative:  
LINNEKIN of Limington

In House, Majority, Ought to pass report read and accepted.

In the Senate:  
Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President, this bill has me somewhat confused as to just what its intent is so therefore I move that this lie on the table pending acceptance of either report.

The motion prevailed.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Transporting Liquor by Minor in Motor Vehicles." (H. P. 1153) (L. D. 1587)

Amended by House Amendment "A" (Filing No. H-286)

Which were read a second time and Passed to be Engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

**Senate**

Resolve, Appropriating Moneys for Vocational and Technical Institution in Northeastern Maine. (S. P. 516) (L. D. 1542)

Which was read a second time. On motion by Mr. Bates of Aroostook, tabled pending passage to be engrossed.

**Enactors**

**The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly engrossed, the following Bills and Resolve:**

Bill, "An Act Relating to Actions for Injuries Causing Death." (H. P. 316) (L. D. 468)

Bill, "An Act Removing Hurricane Island from Territorial Limits of Town of Vinalhaven." (H. P. 410) (L. D. 585)

Bill, "An Act Providing for Civil Service for the Old Orchard Beach Police Department." (H. P. 614) (L. D. 831)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Certain Property of Town of Union, Knox County, Acquired Under Will of Francis E. Thompson." (H. P. 886) (L. D. 1221)

Bill, "An Act Relating to County Appropriations for Industrial De-

velopment in Washington County.” (S. P. 531) (L. D. 1570)

Bill, “An Act Relating to Recording of Conditional Sales.” (H. P. 1148) (L. D. 1580)

Bill, “An Act Relating to Place for Recording Certain Chattel Mortgages.” (H. P. 1149) (L. D. 1581)

Which Bills were passed to be enacted.

Resolve, in Favor of John W. McGuire, of Houlton. (H. P. 951) (L. D. 1254)

Which Resolve was finally passed.

### Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and today assigned item (S. P. 552) (L. D. 1599) bill, “An Act Relating to Operating Business on the Lord’s Day and Certain Holidays” tabled on May 12 by Senator Edgar of Hancock pending passage to be engrossed; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Farris.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, a number of people are vitally interested in this particular measure, including businessmen, industrialists, labor groups and so forth and have requested that this matter be placed upon the table until Thursday next in order that they might present some further amendments and I believe it would actually be in the interests of saving time if we could iron out some of those problems prior to its going to the other Body. Therefore I move that the bill be retabled until Thursday next.

The motion to retable and so assigned prevailed.

The President laid before the Senate the 2nd tabled and today assigned item, (H. P. 900) (L. D. 1234) House Report, Ought not to pass, from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on bill, “An Act Regulating Lobster Traps on Trawls”; tabled on May 12 by Senator Chase of Lincoln pending acceptance of the report; and that Senator moved the pending question.

The motion prevailed and the

Ought not to pass report was accepted in non-concurrence.

Subsequently, on motion by Mr. Chase of Lincoln, the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby it accepted the Ought not to pass report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to substitute the bill for the report.

The bill was given its first reading; House Amendment D was read and adopted and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Davis of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the Special Appropriations Table, S. P. 144, L. D. 327 bill, “An Act Relating to Sewage Pollution Surveys”

Mr. DAVIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, now being advised that there is no cost attached to this bill, I move the pending question.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Edgar of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table the 3rd tabled item (H. P. 304) (L. D. 456) House Reports, Ought not to pass, from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on bill, “An Act Relating to Ferry Service for Long Island Plantation”; tabled on May 3 by Senator Edgar of Hancock.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President, with the consent and approval of both the Senate and House Chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs, I now move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs.

The motion to recommit prevailed.

Sent down for concurrence.

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

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as you know, tomorrow is May 17th and on that day our automatic motion or order concerning tabling goes into effect. I

thought I might say a few words about that so that all of you would be forewarned and prepared. The Order says that we will take from the table the tabled items in the order in which they appear on the calendar. So that we will have no difficulty tomorrow and in the future days, I wish to warn you that unless you have a good reason which has been cleared either by the President of the Senate, the Senate Majority Leader or the Senate Minority Leader, then the Majority Leader will ask for a division and the division, of course, will be against retabing. I would also like to say through the session there are some matters, Mr. President, that I have tabled at the request of other Senators and if I may, I would like to take those off the table at this time and then yield to those Senators so that they will have those bills which are really their own bills, in their possession. I tabled them because the Senators had committee hearings or something else.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 3rd tabled item (S. P. 185) (L. D. 431) Senate Reports from the Committee on State Government on bill, "An Act Relating to Transfer of Portland Municipal Airport by City of Portland to State of Maine"; Report A, Ought to pass; Report B, Ought not to pass; tabled by that Senator on February 21 pending acceptance of either report; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis.

On motion by Mr. Davis of Cumberland, Report A was accepted, the bill read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Lovell of York, the Senate voted to take from the table the 49th tabled item (H. P. 679) (L. D. 957) bill, "An Act Amending Charter of City of Saco"; tabled by that Senator on May 11 pending passage to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 48th tabled item (H. P. 53) (L. D. 904) House Reports from the Committee on State Government on bill, "An Act Relating to Travel Allowance for Members of the Legislature"; Majority report, Ought to pass; Minority report, Ought not to pass; tabled by that Senator on May 11 pending motion by Senator Christie of Aroostook to accept the Minority Ought not to pass report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, I now present Senate Amendment A and move its adoption.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is the motion of Senator Christie of Aroostook, that the Senate accept the minority Ought not to pass report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, before we do that I think I should explain that five or six Senators spoke to the leadership, both the Senate Minority leader and myself, and asked that an amendment be adopted if possible, which calls in addition to the passage of the bill which would give another two cents travel expense, for five dollars a day allowance for each day that the legislature is in session, and that is the wording of Senate Amendment A, so if you wish to consider that, then you would have to vote at this time against acceptance of the Minority Ought not to pass report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would inform the Senator from Franklin, Senator Noyes, that the amendment has not been reproduced.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the bill was laid upon the table pending motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin to adopt Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 51st tabled item (H. P. 208) (L. D. 303) House Reports from the Committee on State Government on bill, "An Act Relating to Officers of the Legislature"; Majority report, Ought not to pass; Minority report, Ought to

pass; tabled by that Senator on either report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, as you know, leadership and quite a few of the Senators and some members of the House have been rediscussing this matter since it came out of committee and in view of that fact, I would now move that this be recommitted to the Committee on State Government.

The motion to recommit prevailed.

Sent down for concurrence.

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

Mr. BATES of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this legislature has passed and we hope will pass bills of considerable merit. I would like to speak to you a few seconds and bring to your attention a bill that was signed by the Governor yesterday which I believe is of tremendous importance. It will help the physicians, the attorneys, the municipal officers, the receiving hospitals, the families involved, the individuals involved and the public in general. It is a measure that has been a matter for considerable discussion in this legislature for many, many years.

I would like to pay tribute to the sponsor of the bill and the committee that heard the bill, the Committee on Health and Institutional Services. I am referring to L. D. 1496, An Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill. I believe it is a very forward step and I believe that each member of this Senate would like to pay tribute to a man whom I believe is primarily responsible, although he would be the first person to say he had considerable assistance, the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Marden.

In conjunction with this, Mr. President, I would like your permission and the permission of the Senate to ask the Page to deliver a copy of this bill just received from the Governor's office, to Senator Marden for him to retain in his permanent possession. It is

now Chapter 303 of the Public Laws. (Applause)

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for the remarks, Senator. If the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Marden would like unanimous consent to address the Senate, I am sure the Senate would be pleased to hear his remarks.

Mr. MARDEN of Kennebec: Mr. President, this bill was not written by me but is a part of a draft act composed over a period of years by those who know what they are talking about. It was put in my hands for promotion by our good Department of Mental Health and Correction. The fact that it is a good bill, in my opinion, has nothing to do with my sponsorship of it, but I am pleased that it is now law and I feel that it is an indication that in many respects, Maine can be a leader and not a follower in legislative affairs. (Applause)

On motion by Mr. Stanley of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table the 36th tabled item (S. P. 52) Senate Report, Ought not to pass, from the Committee on State Government to which was referred Senate Order Relative to Joint Rule No. 23 and Amendments Thereto"; tabled by that Senator on May 4 pending acceptance of the report.

Mr. STANLEY of Penobscot: Mr. President, I realize that all of the material in this Joint Rule No. 23 will be available in the State Library but I would hope it would not be overlooked so that in the next session of the legislature the materials could be used. Not knowing what else to do to keep this alive and knowing that the report was Ought not to pass, I would now move that we accept the Ought not to pass report of the Committee.

The motion prevailed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Farris of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table the 44th tabled item (S. P. 427) (L. D. 1458) Senate Report, Ought not to pass, covered by other legislation, from the Committee on Judiciary on bill, "An

Act Creating District Courts"; tabled by that Senator on May 10 pending acceptance of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Majority Ought not to pass report was accepted.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table the 46th tabled item (H. P. 853) (L. D. 1167) House Report, Ought not to pass, from the Committee on Towns and Counties on bill, "An Act Relating to Compensation of Chief Deputy Sheriff of York County"; tabled by that Senator on May 10 pending acceptance of the report; and that Senator moved the pending question.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this particular bill is a direct county bill, for and only for York County. Our County delegation of 15 representatives and 3 Senators unanimously voted to increase the wages, to create this department of a Chief Deputy, and to increase the wages to approximately a week; I believe it was \$5200 a year and our Committee in the House went against the committee report and it was passed to be engrossed. I think the York County delegation feel that this money has already been appropriated in the bills for counties, for the money to be raised in taxation in the coming year, and includes this raise for the York County Chief Deputy Sheriff. I would hope that the motion of the good Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, will be defeated.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill, if passed, will give the Chief Deputy Sheriff in York County more money than all but two of our high sheriffs are presently receiving. The argument of home rule is always brought up but these matters have been left to our legislature by our predecessors in their wisdom and until the legislature decides to take these salary matters away from the legislature and give them to the county officers to decide their own salaries, or have them decided by the county commission-

ers or otherwise, we feel it our duty to hear the evidence presented in favor of the bill and then to report.

In one way it is truly a York County matter but in another way, what York County does effects York County and eventually it spreads all over the state. So if you say "home rule", then I think we should pass a bill taking all of these matters from the hands of the legislature. Otherwise it would seem useless for us to hear these bills and go along with them. I hope that the motion to accept the committee report prevails and I ask for a division.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like to inquire through the President, of the Chairman of the Committee on Towns and Counties as to whether there is any other county where the legislature has ever established the salary of a Chief Deputy Sheriff.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Kennebec, Senator Farris poses a question to the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, who may answer if he wishes.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, I don't recall that there is. I may be wrong. I am not certain, but I will say that we have given all of the Chief Deputies through the state an increase this year.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President, I know of no statute establishing a Chief Deputy Sheriffs salaries. I do appreciate the problem in many of our larger counties as far as obtaining the services of a good criminal investigator who usually is the Chief Deputy Sheriff. In Cumberland County there is now a provision whereby the County Commissioners may establish a salary above the per diem salary which has been allowed by legislative action. In Kennebec County, many of us wish to have L. D. 230 pass which is now back in the Committee on Towns and Counties so that we here in Kennebec through our County Commissioners, can increase the per diem allowance for our Chief Deputy Sheriff, and I

feel that that same procedure would be the proper procedure to be utilized in York County, rather than putting on the statute books an exact salary which as Senator Wyman of Washington has said, is inevitably going to have a very inflationary effect upon the Chief Deputies of each county in the state. For that reason I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I only speak as the Chairman of the York County Delegation. This man, this Chief Deputy Sheriff, incidentally, is not of my party. However, the majority of our delegation have voted this raise to this office, as they did to one other office, the Clerk of Courts. Consequently, it seems to me that our delegation has gone on record for this and I certainly feel that I should speak for it because they feel that they cannot get the proper man for less than \$100 a week, a man without training and experience to do the job of Chief Deputy Sheriff of York County.

Now, to me a hundred dollars a week for a Chief Deputy Sheriff who works sometimes 20 to 24 hours a day and seven days a week, is not a very high salary to give the proper type of man. They certainly must pay a good salary. I would like to ask the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman — at that hearing was there any opposition on this bill or were they all against the bill in the first place or what was the opposition?

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator Lovell, poses a question to the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman who may answer if he wishes.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, I don't have my notes here now and I cannot give Senator Lovell a direct answer on this. I do know that we compared this with other bills and the fact that we had already given the chief deputies a raise and it just seemed to us that we should not pass this bill out Ought to pass and I cannot see why if this is going to be left to the delegation

to decide, why is it brought before the legislature?

Mr. ERWIN of York: Mr. President, I would like to clarify my position. As a member of the Committee on Towns and Counties, I voted against the bill in committee and as a member of the York County delegation I also voted against it in the delegation. I hesitate to differ with my colleague, Senator Lovell of York, and in all fairness to him, he is reporting what he is duty bound to report and that is the majority report of the York County delegation. I must confess I agree with both Senator Wyman and Senator Farris that this is a bad bill and not consistent with the normal procedure in county operations with regard to Chief Deputy Sheriffs and therefore I hope Senator Farris motion to indefinitely postpone will prevail.

Mr. PIKE of Oxford: Mr. President, I just simply want to back my colleagues on the Towns and Counties Committee, Senator Wyman and Senator Erwin. I voted against this and I would again. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of Senator Farris of Kennebec to indefinitely postpone.

A viva voce being had.

The motion to indefinitely postpone prevailed, in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table the 1st tabled item (H. P. 47) (L. D. 88) House Report, Ought to pass, from the Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on bill, "An Act Repealing the Time Limitation on Statute Repealing the Two Inch Clam Law"; tabled by that Senator on February 1 pending acceptance of the report; and on motion by that Senator, the Ought to pass report was accepted, the bill read once, Senate Amendment A read and adopted, and the bill as amended tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to

take from the table the second tabled item (H. P. 13) (L. D. 32) bill, "An Act Relating to Certain Standards for Nursing Homes"; tabled by that Senator on February 16 pending adoption of Senate Amendment A.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, L. D. 32, if you will turn to it, you will find that it permits nursing homes, boarding homes and lodging homes to have five or less boarders or patients without coming under the building exit code.

The Amendment S-16 would strike out the nursing home part of that bill and that is the point I wish to oppose.

At the close of my remarks I shall move indefinite postponement of Senate Amendment A. Very briefly I want to say that I am sure that most members of this Body are very familiar with our nursing homes and when I say nursing homes I am referring in most cases to private homes that at the present time are allowed to have up to three patients without coming under the Code and they find that with all of the increased costs of operating a home, it is almost impossible to even pay their bills to say nothing about making a profit. I grant you that those that oppose this thinking of mine will tell you that state patients in these homes are going to pay more, the state is going to pay more for their being able to become a patient in this type of home.

I still maintain, because I have visited many of these homes in my area and outside of my area, which tell me that unless they can have up to five patients they will not be able to give the service which they think should be given and which they are giving at the present time. I could talk at some length on this but I think that most of you are very much concerned with some of our elderly people having an opportunity to stay in these homes when they are unable to care for themselves and for that reason, Mr. President, I am going to move for the indefinite postponement of

Senate Amendment A and ask for a division.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in opposition to the motion of Senator Parker of Piscataquis, that this amendment be indefinitely postponed. I have a bill on the table, a bill which I introduced which says in effect that all nursing homes regardless of the number of patients shall comply with the regulations and requirements of the Building Code with respect to fire protection.

If this amendment were not adopted, this bill would be in direct conflict with the bill which I have on the table in that it would set the figure at five or more patients and in such cases the nursing homes would be compelled to comply, but at five or less patients they would not. If this amendment is adopted contrary to the motion of Senator Parker, I will be very happy to take my bill off the table at this time and debate it. But the primary reason why the amendment that Senator Parker has been discussing should not be defeated, is because it complies with the original intentions of the sponsor of the bill.

I have talked with the sponsor of this bill and he did not intend to include nursing homes in his bill and at the time of the hearing he offered an amendment to the committee eliminating the nursing homes in line with his desire to have this bill cover only boarding and lodging homes. I have no objection to this bill with the amendment eliminating nursing homes. As I say the sponsor of the bill had no intention of including nursing homes and somehow the bill came out of committee without his amendment attached to it and this amendment was introduced by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Lord, in compliance with the wishes of the sponsor of the bill. So, I hope that the motion to indefinitely postpone the amendment will not prevail.

Mrs. LORD of Cumberland: Mr. President, very briefly I would like to say that I agree with Senator Edgar of Hancock. These people in nursing homes are very often

not ambulatory. They have to be carried and there is a difference between five people who can walk out themselves and five who have to be carried out in case of fire. I think that is the reason for this amendment and I hope the amendment is not indefinitely postponed.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, there seems to be some confusion as to what the actual thinking the sponsor of this bill had in his mind. As has been indicated by my good friend the Senator from Hancock, Senator Edgar, the sponsor of the bill may not have intended to have had five patients in this bill, but the number was offered. It is just as important that they be in there as though when the bill was first written they were put in. I can assure you that if this bill is passed without the amendment it will be a service to elderly people of the State of Maine. I can assure you that having visited some of these homes that the patients themselves would like to have this bill passed without the amendment. I also can assure you that I personally in no way want to provide anything that is going to be a fire hazard for any of our patients but I can see the reason why if it is reasonably safe for three, and it has been over the years, why it shouldn't be safe for two or three more if it is necessary. I hope my motion carries.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I will agree with the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker that there seems to be some confusion but I suggest that the confusion is not on the part of the sponsor of the bill or myself. I believe that Senator Parker had in mind while he was talking, nursing homes. Now nursing homes present an entirely different picture than boarding homes or lodging homes. The nursing homes are dealing in the most part with bed ridden non-ambulatory patients who are unable to care for themselves. This bill that we are now considering has nothing to do with nursing homes provided this amendment is adopted. The amend-

ment is designed to eliminate nursing homes as was the intent of the sponsor. The bill with the amendment would apply only to boarding homes and lodging homes. I have no quarrel with that because the people in boarding homes and lodging homes are not bedridden and are ambulatory and able to care for themselves in cases of fire. They are better prepared to effect their own escape. Nursing homes are a different proposition and if the Senate will adopt this amendment and pass this bill with the amendment, again along with the intent of the sponsor of the bill, then I will take the nursing home bill off the table and Senator Parker will have every opportunity to debate that subject. I hope again, that the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis does not prevail.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have had some contact with these nursing homes in our county and I find it would be very difficult to find places for some of these people if all the requirements that are suggested should be carried out. The homes to which I refer are careful and they take good care of these patients and have never let any trouble occur. I feel it would be a hardship to many in our county if more strict regulations should be carried out.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President, again may I point out that this bill has nothing to do with nursing homes, if this amendment is adopted. If Senator Christie wants to eliminate the nursing homes from these requirements, she will do so by voting in favor of the amendment. The amendment would eliminate nursing homes from this bill and would make the application only to lodging homes and boarding homes. So to accomplish what the good Senator from Aroostook has in mind, she should oppose the indefinite postponement of the amendment which would eliminate nursing homes.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President, I am afraid that the Senator from Hancock, Sen-

ator Edgar has misunderstood my thinking. Perhaps I did not express myself very clearly. I am thinking of nursing homes and that is why I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President, could we have a five-minute recess?

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman, requests a five-minute recess. Before we honor his request the Chair would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Senators 125 8th grade students — and I think that is the largest group that ever attended this assembly — from the Purchase St. School in Rockland. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Young, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Fiske and Mr. Burke. It is certainly a pleasure to have this group of young folk with us. We hope that your stay is enjoyable and educational and we know that some day you will be taking your places in the Senate Chambers, representing your county. At this time I would like to introduce the Senator from your county, Senator Carl Stilphen, who represents the people of your county. It is a pleasure to have you with us. (Applause)

I think we will have to have the Senator Chambers enlarged to take care of these groups. It is wonderful to have you come.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Hancock, Senator Edgar.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President, before you declare a recess may I say one more thing?

If I understood Senator Christie's desires they are to prevent nursing homes from having to meet these requirements. Am I correct Senator?

Mrs. CHRISTIE: Yes.

Mr. EDGAR: This amendment eliminates nursing homes and makes this bill apply only to lodging homes and boarding homes. Nursing homes will not be affected in any way by this bill if this amendment is adopted. The bill which I have on the table will affect nursing homes, and I suggest that we adopt this amendment, which does not apply to nursing homes, and then debate

my bill which does apply to nursing homes.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President, this bill and the amendment had me fooled until I noticed the only change in it is the fact that the words "and patients" is left out after "boarders," and that changes the whole thing. I did not know which side I was on for a long time, so if anybody else is confused I don't blame them.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will declare a five-minute recess.

(Recess)

Called to order by the President.

The PRESIDENT: At the time of recess we were considering Item 2 on Page 4, H. P. 13, L. D. 32, "An Act relating to Certain Standards for Nursing Homes."

The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, that Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate: After conferring with Senator Christie I find that the reason for the confusion was because what the Senator desires is not only to restrict nursing, lodging and boarding homes as far as fire safety is concerned but to even liberalize the present law.

The present laws says that no nursing home with three or less patients must comply with the building code. What this will do, if this amendment is indefinitely postponed and the bill is passed as written, will be to leave nursing homes in the bill contrary, as I said, to the intent of the sponsor, and will go even further and liberalize the present law from a minimum of three people to a minimum of five people. Now that was so far from my thoughts that possibly I just did not grasp what Senator Christie had in mind.

But here we are dealing with human lives, that is what it boils down to. If you keep in mind nursing homes, you must remember that nursing involves bed-ridden patients, patients who are not ambulatory and able to help themselves, patients who would be completely helpless and depend-

ent upon others in case of a fire. I do not care what the size of the nursing home is in relation to the number of patients; I contend that the life of one patient is just as deserving of saving as are the lives of ten or twelve or more patients. I do not think we can draw a line anywhere and say that less than three lives we do not have to worry about but more than three we should, or less than five or more than five. I think that one life is just as important as any number.

Now if the motion of Senator Parker to indefinitely postpone this amendment prevails you will in effect be liberalizing even the present law which sets a minimum of three patients and raising it up to five. If his motion does not prevail you will be discarding completely consideration of nursing homes, which is my only consideration; and then I will take my nursing home bill off the table and we can battle it out as to what the minimum number should be in a nursing home. So I certainly hope that the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, does not prevail.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Edgar, because I am sure that he himself was somewhat confused as to what we were attempting under this bill and under the amendment, and I think that we are now on solid ground. He agrees, as I agree, that if this amendment is killed nursing homes will be allowed to have up to five patients without coming under the code.

I am sure that it is as safe for five patients to be in these nursing homes where the proprietors are careful, as most elderly people are. And may I say that most of these homes are being provided by elderly people, people of possibly fifty years or so of age, and who are in most cases that I have observed, and I have visited many of them, former nurses and their husbands who operate these homes. They are careful with fire. We have never had a fire in my area in these small homes to my knowledge. I am sure that if this motion

which I have made to indefinitely postpone — and may I say, Mr. President, I ask for a division — if my motion prevails, that these small homes that are now being allowed to have three patients, and because of the increased cost of living and providing care it is necessary to have additional income which would be provided if they could have up to five patients instead of three — I am sure that if this carries the elderly people of the State of Maine that are now in these small nursing homes will be very thankful for what this legislature has done to allow them to stay in a home instead of in an institution. Thank you very much.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I am sure that if we liberalize the present fire protection laws that the operators of these small nursing homes will be very pleased with what the State of Maine has done, but I submit that if we should have a fire in one of these homes with the very possible disastrous results — and I refer of course, to the loss of lives of patients — how pleased with what the State of Maine has done will the families and relatives of those victims be? It is with those victims that I am far more concerned than pleasing the proprietors of the homes, although I can sympathize with their position.

It is very, very common practice for the legislature to require certain types of business to measure up to the responsibilities which go along with that type of business, and, as hard-hearted as it might sound, I contend that if a person is not able to adequately meet the responsibilities that go along with the type of work that they are undertaking then the State should step in and say no, you cannot go into that line of business, you cannot be in that line of business until you can meet these responsibilities, and I contend that the responsibility of saving and protecting the lives of their bedridden patients is the prime responsibility.

I repeat: I hope that the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, does not prevail.

Mrs. CHRISTIE of Aroostook: Mr. President, my first concern is not the operators of these nursing homes, my first concern is for the elderly people who might at any time become bedridden and they might perhaps designate the place where they would stay as a nursing home and they would have no place to go if these small nursing homes were closed. I know of places like that; I know that more strict regulations were suggested in the case of one home. These people in that home would not know where to go because there would be no place for them unless they had this place where they are now living.

In Aroostook County we have not too many nursing homes. I have never know of a fire in any of them, and I wonder whether we should consider the remote possibility of a fire as against the very definite possibility of having no place for these elderly, infirm people to go. These nursing homes cannot operate with fewer than five patients, and I feel that unless they do operate some of these elderly people will be without a place to go.

Mr. EDGAR of Hancock: Mr. President, just once more and I will be quiet.

I can appreciate the fact that there is a shortage of places for the elderly and the infirm to go for care; I can appreciate that the families of these people, the relatives of these people are most anxious to find places for them to stay; but I dispute the implication that the families and relatives of these people are anxious to put them in places which are not adequately protected against the hazards of fire. No matter how desperate I might be to have one of my loved ones put in a nursing home, I would certainly have a good deal of pause, in spite of my desperation before I would put that person in a home that was not adequately protected against the hazards of fire.

Mr. CYR of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I fail to comprehend the opposition of Senator Edgar in regard to defeating this amendment. If you read the bill and you read

the amendment you will see that the amendment only changes the title, that is all it calls for, to change the title from "nursing" to "boarding homes." That is all it does.

Now he seemed to be in favor of the bill itself, but in the bill itself you have the last paragraph which says, "such regulations shall not apply to boarding, lodging or nursing homes having five or less boarders or patients." So there is a contradiction there to a certain extent. His opposition is to the amendment and yet the only thing the amendment does is to change the wording of the title from "nursing" to "boarding."

Pardon me, because maybe I am wrong. It does leave out "nursing" in the last line. My apologies to Senator Edgar.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President, when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, that Senate Amendment "A" be Indefinitely Postponed, and that Senator has requested a division.

All those in favor of the motion of the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker, That Senate Amendment "A" be Indefinitely Postponed will rise and stand in their places until counted.

A division was had.

Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and ten in the negative, the motion prevailed and Senate Amendment "A" was Indefinitely Postponed.

On further motion by the same senator the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table the 9th tabled and unassigned matter (S. P. 16) (L. D. 16) Senate Reports from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill, "An Act Establishing a Uniform Open Deer Season," Majority Report, "Ought not to Pass"; minority report "Ought to pass," tabled on March 24th by that Senator pending acceptance of either report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, for the same reasons I stated this morning, I would yield to the sponsor of this bill, the Senator from Sagadahoc, Senator Mayo.

Mr. MAYO of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I would request the privilege of retabbling this bill. My reasons are that there is another bill on the table which was tabled by the Senator from Somerset, Senator Carpenter which we had originally agreed would come off the table today, but where he is absent we cannot debate the bill that he has tabled and they are more or less companion-type bills. I would therefore request that this bill be retabled.

The bill was thereupon tabled pending acceptance of either report.

---

On motion by Mr. Porteous of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table the 35th tabled and unassigned matter, (S. P. 2) (L. D. 2) Senate Report "Ought not to pass" from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve, Appropriating Moneys to Promote and advertise Maine's Ski Business," tabled on May 4th by that Senator pending acceptance of report.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: The intent of this bill, of course, is to give a boost to a very important and growing recreation industry. One of the reasons for this special type of appropriation would be that the great weight of our publicity and advertising in national magazines and newspapers throughout the country is at the time of the summertime vacation business and therefore we do not have much of an impact on people outside of the State of Maine during other months. The other side of this question is that if this bill were passed it would appropriate moneys for a dedicated, specific industry, which I consider as good. I believe that something along this line in years to come should be done. I am not going to make any motion but I would like to

yield to the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Marden.

Mr. MARDEN of Kennebec: Mr. President, I thank Senator Porteous for his suprise.

The subject-matter of this legislation is one in which I have had a peculiar interest for some time, particularly in the light of our studies at the University of Maine and our underlying problems economics-wise in this State: How to raise more money; how to broaden our tax base, and on and on. It has long struck me, my friends of the Senate, that we are missing the boat in one respect and particularly in the area of recreational development. In using these words I know that it will sound like a song which has been sung many times before, but I know of no better way to express it than to say that this may be one of our crying needs and desires in the State of Maine at this time. And, gentlemen, I further hesitate in mentioning it because you can hear me speak and then say, "Well, that is all right for you because you like to ski and you like the recreational benefits for yourself and your family, but there are many and more important considerations which we should consider." And every time that I think that perhaps I am wrong and I am prejudiced and that I should level my thinking to broader subject-matters, I look at the parking lot at the Sugarloaf ski area in Kingfield and I see that there are more out-of-state cars than Maine cars. And I drive by the camping grounds, for example, in Camden and I am told there is standing room only at certain periods of the year; and I go to the Boothbay town meeting and I hear them debate and argue and appropriate a hundred dollars for a Chamber of Commerce when the best estimate is that about three million dollars passed through there by way of summer business; and I watch the people head south in the wintertime when other people head north into Maine to enjoy some of our wonderful new developments in winter recreation; and I read the ads in the magazines and I see the states

of Arkansas, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Washington State, Canada, the Provinces, sections of California, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for what they must by now be convinced is a good investment; and I see in the back pages of these same magazines a quarter-page, one-column, black and white ad saying something about "Coming to Maine? Fill in the coupon for more information", then all of a sudden my prejudices arise again and I get worked up about this thing and I feel very strongly when I see a legislative document such as this one before this legislature, and whether or not it has a bare chance or no chance of passing, I would rather say something than see it go by without saying something.

In my judgment, good friends, this is one of the answers to this state, this is not the whole answer but this is one of the answers, and, in connection with my thinking, and I feel quite strongly about it, I am forced to make a motion. I know of no other motion to make. My motion, therefore, Mr. President, would be that we substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, I would like to speak on this bill if I may because, in the first place, it happens to be my bill. It is true that I introduced a similar bill in this legislature two years ago and the Senate was very kind to me, they turned it out "Ought to pass" and it went to the House and was finally killed. I understand the same thing is in the wind in this matter. But I would like to say first that I would like to have removed from the consideration of this bill the fact that this is my bill. I think that is very bad.

I suppose one cannot help but being slightly prejudiced because of the fact that in Franklin County the three major ski areas of all Maine have developed, but likewise in Cumberland we have a major ski development, Pleasant Mountain; Penobscot and Knox County have ski developments, they have two in Oxford County now, certainly major ones; and so this matter of ski areas is fast becoming a state issue, and, like-

wise, this request for \$30,000 of advertising money is a statewide request, because people, whether they come from New Hampshire or Canada or from down-country through the New England States, must travel some part of Maine to get to any of these skiing areas.

I would like to bring to your attention the fact that within a 450 mile radius of any of these ski areas in Maine there are 1,600,000 skiers. Now that is a lot of business. Now they tell us it is all right to advertise to come to Maine for hunting and fishing, canoeing and for other purposes but when you talk about skiing it is a selfish purpose. I think not. I think it helps the entire state.

Now we are about fifteen or twenty-five years behind New Hampshire in skiing, and I think it is about time that we caught up, and if the people of Maine—and it is the people of Maine who have built these ski areas; they are all a public subscription proposition, no one owns even a majority control in any of these ski areas—if the people of Maine are willing to contribute and to work hard and to advertise and build an industry which helps the entire state, certainly it is not too selfish to ask for \$30,000.

I would like to remind you that the legislature in New York two years ago appropriated nine million dollars, and it is a matter of record, to help not only advertise but to build ski areas; and last week in our sister State of New Hampshire, as you all know, a ten million dollar bond issue was passed to help not only the ski industry but the other segments of the recreation industry and to provide for more promotion.

Now \$30,000 I know is a lot of money, but all we are saying is: isn't it possible somewhere in the amount of money that is going to be appropriated, we hope, to DED that we at least have this earmarked or have it arranged in some manner so that we can bring the ski industry into the picture?

I think the good Senator from Kennebec, Senator Marden, has made a motion and if he has not

I would move that we substitute the bill for the report.

Mr. BROOKS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I started skiing back in 1934 and I started over in New Hampshire and we used to ski on what we call the Eastern Slopes area, and we were required to climb Mt. Washington into Tuckerman's Ravine and those places for skiing. As time progressed, I watched that particular area in New Hampshire develop its skiing industry. We all know today the fantastic aid to the New Hampshire economy that skiing has given in just this one area that I speak of. I mention that only as background because it is very interesting to me to note that also in this area in New Hampshire the recreational business in the summertime has developed in the small towns in New Hampshire that some years ago were quiet, and they have now developed motels and restaurants and so forth into a year-round industry. I think most people who have been in that area in the summertime will agree that New Hampshire today in the summertime, as a result of skiing in the winter, has developed a good business from tourists.

Now what do we have in Maine that is a parallel, or do we have a parallel? I think in Maine we have so much more to offer to the tourist than any state in New England. The skiing industry in Maine is just getting under way, as my colleagues have stated; it is a growing industry and we are either going to get in it or we are going to fall by the wayside. The same people that come up here in the wintertime to ski are going to come back in the summertime to enjoy our summer recreation. I think that a bill such as this to appropriate funds for a specific element of our recreational business is a good bill, and I concur with the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Marden and the Senator from Franklin, Senator Noyes. Thank you.

Mr. LOVELL of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I am not a skier, I have never skied in my life, so certainly I am

not prejudiced on this particular bill. I would say, however, that this \$30,000 invested in publicity for advertising the skiing business can well bring back to Maine a half million dollars more in direct tax revenue than we are now getting. For example, in the State of Colorado for every dollar that they spent last year—and this survey comes from the Department of Area Development, Department of Commerce, in Washington—they got back \$298 of money from the tourists for every dollar they spent, and Colorado is sparsely settled; they have a good deal of skiing but I don't know where they get their population to ski there, but certainly it shows what they can do in Colorado. Down in North Carolina for every dollar they spend they get back \$390 from the tourist business. In the State of Florida, although they do not have skiing they realize the value of tourist business, and for every dollar they spent they got back \$92 in taxes alone through the State.

The Portland Press Herald states in an editorial, in part: "Tourist business in Maine, as well as in every other part of the nation which attracts summer visitors, seems headed for its biggest year. Unfortunately, it appears that the expected increase will benefit Maine less than most any other state. The legislature won't, however, if past performance is indicative, appropriate anything like the minimum that will be needed to recapture the tourists we have lost to other states. The state should be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for promotion purposes instead of the pittance it spreads around."

The Bangor Daily News states: "A recent national travel survey indicates that Vacationland, Maine, is falling far short of its potential." They go on to state that we have a tremendous opportunity here in Maine but we are not publicizing it the way we should.

Now in the last two years we have had something of a recession. However, in the last fiscal year our tax receipts increased by six million dollars, and a couple of months ago our tax increase for

this year was 3.2 million dollars. Certainly we have had some sort of a recession, but if you will read the papers, and I know that you all have, you will find that the skiing business has progressed tremendously in the last two or three years, and without question the increase in the receipts from sales tax and the other taxes which has put us above recent years, one of the chief reasons is the wonderful ski business which has developed in the State of Maine.

I feel without question this money should be double what is asked, but I definitely feel that here is an investment that you senators can make that will increase our tax revenue so greatly that many other bills you want in this session can well be paid for by this \$30,000. According to the Maine average every dollar spent brings back one hundred and fifty dollars in business from the tourists. There will be no exception in the skiing business, it may go even higher, and it will in turn give us a great increase in our over-all tax picture.

I would move for a division on this motion, and I hope in conjunction with the other good Senators who have already spoken, that we pass this bill.

Mr. CHASE of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate: When the bill came in here to study the Chebeague Island Bridge I spoke for it and I voted for it. I felt that this was one of the forward steps to develop our state, and I said at the time that the recreation industry is one of our greatest assets here in the State of Maine.

Up at the University of Maine at the conference, from the Sly report we learned that each individual in the State of Maine is taxed very high per capita. That is due to our sparsely-settled state.

From the beginning of this legislature I have been opposed to any increase in the sales tax until such time as I can see that we are going to use some money to help ourselves. To me this is a good bill, this is a step in the right direction, to try to help ourselves. This involves about thirty thousand dol-

lars, and I think myself it is a very forward step. Certainly if we cannot do something to relieve the situation we are in why should we continually raise taxes and to expect better services and more things for our people when whether we can pay for them is questionable.

We must look to the future in this state; we have got to think of the days ahead; we have got to look at this as a business proposition, and we should not be afraid to spend a little money for something that will bring us money in return. I think most everyone in this State realizes that you have got to spend money to make money. Certainly in this state, when we have an industry that is growing like this ski industry in the wintertime when we need it, and they are only for the small amount of thirty thousand dollars to promote something that is a natural asset here in the State, I think this body would be doing a very foolish thing if they turned down this type of legislation. Thank you very much.

Mr. FARRIS of Kennebec: Mr. President and members of the Senate: This is an appropriation measure which, like all others, if passed, will eventually be placed upon the special appropriations table, and once it is determined the amount of money available for the various needs of the state, final enactment of the actual amount will then be definitely determined.

I know there has been some mention of the fact that this might be a bill for a specialized industry such as the ski industry, and the reason I rise is to tell you my experience with the individuals in the State of Maine who are engaged in the ski industry. This session is the first time I have ever had occasion to be directly associated and involved with any of their problems: You will recall that there is a bill before the legislature creating a Tramway Board. That bill carried with it an appropriation measure, and the purpose of the legislation was to establish a board composed of the people in the ski industry for improving safety standards on our

ski slopes. This bill also carried an appropriation measure. It was the feeling of the Committee on Legal Affairs that the present system of inspection by the Insurance Department was sufficient so that it would not be wise to spend additional moneys that would result in the creation of a new board, but this industry voluntarily assumed to tax itself in order to accomplish the purpose of having a tramway board, which I think all of us realize is a step in the right direction. When that industry is willing to tax itself to provide more inspection, better safety and better ski areas here in the State of Maine I feel that they are deserving of a bouquet and I certainly feel that when we can consider pledging the credit of the State of Maine for recreational purposes, that before we give any consideration to that first we should spend what is called for here, a very meager amount of money in comparison with the benefits to be obtained, the sum of \$3,000. I hope that the motion to substitute the bill for the report prevails.

Mr. CYR of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I subscribe to most of the statements that have been made here this morning in regard to this subject. However, in my inquisitive mind there seemed to be a lot of questions that are popping up which I find no one has given any answer to. For instance, I would like to know in the other states where they have done advertising for their ski resources whether the budget has been incorporated in their publicity department or in their economic development department such as we have. I am wondering also if we would not be accomplishing more for the purpose—and after all what we want is more skiers coming into the State of Maine—I am wondering if we could not accomplish more with this \$30,000 if it was incorporated in the publicity bureau or in the DED budget where we already have the tools for advertising. Now will this bill here create another board? Will it create another de-

partment? Will it create more personnel whose efforts will be directed just to the ski business? Just how is it going to work? Will a good part of this \$30,000 be spent for salaries or will it be spent for actual advertising? If so, wouldn't we do more good by incorporating this with the bureaus that we already have existing? This is just in the form of a question, and certainly if somebody has the answer I would like to know the answer.

Mr. NOYES of Franklin: Mr. President, I think we can answer it very well by referring to S. P. 2, which says that this sum of \$30,000 will be spent by the Department of Economic Development, so therefore it does not require additional personnel or a board or anything else. As a matter of fact, it is for advertising and it is paid directly to the newspapers and magazines as is the other advertising money we are now spending for promoting hunting, fishing and other things. There is no personnel or overhead or boards involved.

The PRESIDENT: Does that answer the question of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Cyr?

Mr. CYR: Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. DAVIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I realize, of course, that the Maine ski industry is a very important segment of our recreational business, and I certainly would be willing to do all that I could to assist it. I do think I should state to you briefly what the reasons of the committee were in turning this out with an "Ought not to pass" report. Most of these reasons, I think, have been brought up here by the proponents. As a matter of fact, I did not know that I was going to be the only one to speak against the bill. We had two reasons for reporting it out "Ought not to pass." One is that the bill calls for money to be taken from the unappropriated surplus of the State. We feel that this would probably be a recurring expense and should be taken from the general fund. Secondly, we were against earmarking it for a specific recreational industry. We

have the Department of Economic Development, we appropriate funds for the general advertising of all phases of the industry, and we felt that this should be appropriated under the same conditions. I certainly have no objection to the appropriation if the bill is amended to broaden it.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of Senator Marden of Kennebec to substitute the bill for the report.

A division of the Senate was had.

Twenty-one having voted in the affirmative and five opposed, the motion prevailed, the bill was read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair notices in the Senate Chambers a former member of the Senate and former Attorney General, Frank Harding, accompanied by a person we all admire and have a lot of respect for. She has been very kind to the guests at the hotel, Hannelore Erika Bower of Salzburg, Austria. It is a pleasure for me as President of the Senate to introduce these folks to you. Will they please rise? (Applause) We hope that Miss Bower's stay in this country has been enjoyable and hope she continues to live here.

On motion by Mr. Noyes of Franklin

Recessed until 1:30 this afternoon.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to announce that there will not be a joint convention this afternoon. Through misinformation that came to me from the Governor's office, the Convention was announced for today but will be on Thursday at ten o'clock, instead of this afternoon.

At this point, the Senator from Franklin, Senator Noyes, at the invitation of the President, assumed the Chair.

Mr. Porteous of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. PORTEOUS of Cumberland: Mr. President, this is not perhaps really addressing the Senate, but I would request the Chair to clear up in my mind anyway about the Joint Convention that was announced to be held and whether it is going to be held next Thursday and who it is that is going to talk to us. What is it all about?

The PRESIDENT pro tem: The Chair would inform the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Porteous and the Senate, that the Joint Convention will be held next Thursday and will be re-announced. I do not know exactly why it was postponed today.

The Senate is proceeding under Orders of the Day and we hope to get a few items off the table.

On motion by Mr. Lovell of York

Adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.