

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF THE

Ninety-Eighth Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

VOLUME II

1957

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL
AUGUSTA, MAINE

SENATE

Tuesday, May 21, 1957

Senate called to order by the President.

Prayer by Rev. Alfred Ives of Gardiner.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, Journal of yesterday read and approved.

Papers from the House

“Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Provide for Election of Members of the Executive Council.” (S. P. 95) (L. D. 225)

In House, May 15, Failed of final passage

In Senate, May 16, voted to insist on former action whereby the resolve was passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment A and by House Amendment A in concurrence.

Comes from the House, “Engrossed Resolve Placed on File”—Sent up for concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Low of Knox, the resolve and accompanying papers were returned to the House.

Bill, “An Act Relating to Fortnightly Payment of Salaries to State Officers and Employees.” (S. P. 149) (L. D. 349)

In Senate, May 17, accepted Report A—(OTP. in New Draft (S. P. 462) (L. D. 1317)—from the Committee on State Govt., and bill in New Draft passed to be engrossed.

Comes from House, Report B—ONTP — accepted, in non concurrence.

In the Senate on motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, the Senate voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Bill, “An Act Relating to Geological Survey Publications.” (S. P. 232) (L. D. 633)

In Senate on May 16, passed to be engrossed.

Comes from the House, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing 468) in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, that Body voted to recede and concur.

Bill, “An Act Relating to Employment of Minors.” (H. P. 546) (L. D. 773)

In Senate on May 17, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing 334) in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was indefinitely postponed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Curtis of Cumberland, the Senate voted to insist and ask for a Committee of Conference.

Bill, “An Act to Repeal the Westbrook Sewerage District.” (H. P. 688) (L. D. 949)

In Senate on May 17, Indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Comes from the House, that body having insisted upon its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, now asks for a Committee of Conference.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Senate voted to insist and join in the Committee of Conference, and the President appointed as Senate conferees, Senators: Martin of Kennebec, Rogerson of Aroostook and Davis of Cumberland.

**House Committee Reports
Leave to Withdraw**

The Committee on Retirements and Pensions on “Resolve, Providing an Increase in State Pension for Lillian M. Dennis of Saco.” (H. P. 626) (L. D. 888) reported that the same be granted Leave to Withdraw.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence.

Ought Not to Pass

The Committee on Judiciary on Recommitted Bill, “An Act Relating to Evidence of Intoxication and Chemical Tests for Alcoholic Content of Blood of Motor Vehicle Drivers.” (H. P. 507) (L. D. 717) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on recommitted “Resolve Authorizing For-

estry Resource Survey." (H. P. 588) (L. D. 837) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Comes from the House, resolve substituted for the report and passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, the ought not to pass report was accepted in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill, "An Act Relating to Closed Season on Deer in Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington." (H. P. 160) (L. D. 207) reported that the same Ought Not to Pass.

Comes from the House, bill substituted for report and passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the bill was laid upon the table pending consideration of the report.

Ought to Pass

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill, "An Act Prohibiting Dogs Running at Large." (H. P. 601) (L. D. 848) reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Comes from the House, report accepted and bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment A (Filing No. 408)

In the Senate, the report was read and accepted; House Amendment A was read and adopted and the bill as amended, under suspension of the rules was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on Bill, "An Act Relating to Travel by Inspectors of Table Stock Potatoes." (H. P. 497) (L. D. 709) reported that the same Ought to Pass.

Which report was read and accepted in concurrence, the bill read once and under suspension of the rules was read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Ought to Pass—N.D.—New Title

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve in Favor of Town of Newport,

Penobscot County." (H. P. 338) (L. D. 470) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1094) (L. D. 1590) under New Title: "Resolve Relating to Research and Experimental Work in Relation to the Eradication of Aquatic Weeds," and that it Ought to Pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve Authorizing Study of the Problems of the Uninsured Motorist." (H. P. 991) (L. D. 1420) reported same in New Draft (H. P. 1093) (L. D. 1589) under New Title: "Resolve Authorizing Legislative Research Committee Study of the Problems of the Uninsured Motorist," and that it Ought to Pass.

Which reports were read and accepted and under suspension of the rules, the resolves in new draft were given their two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Ought to Pass—as amended

The Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs on "Resolve Appropriating Money for Forest Rehabilitation." (H. P. 337) (L. D. 469) reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 438).

The same Committee on "Resolve Authorizing Funds for Medical and Dental Education for New England Board of Higher Education." (H. P. 581) (L. D. 830) reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 440)

The same Committee on "Resolve Authorizing Research of Cystic Fibrosis, a Disease of Children." (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1134) reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 439)

(On motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, tabled pending consideration of the report and especially assigned for later in today's session.)

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill, "An Act Revising the General Laws Relating to Municipalities." (H. P. 320) (L. D. 437) reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 442)

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Acknowledgment and Validation of Certain Instru-

ments." (H. P. 369) (L. D. 499) reported that the same Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 443)

Which reports were severally read and accepted in concurrence and the bills and resolves read once. Committee Amendments A were read and adopted in concurrence and under suspension of the rules, the bills and resolves were read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair notes in the Senate Chamber a group of students from St. Joseph High School of Biddeford with Sisters Gertrude, St. Paul and Aime. On behalf of the Senate, Sisters and youngsters, we extend to you a very hearty welcome to our session. Each one of us will pledge to you all of the attention we can give to you to make your day a happy one here in the Maine legislature and each one of us hopes that some of you will be inspired to someday be one of the attractive ladies of the Senate, doing your part in civic government. Thank you very much for coming.

**Majority — OTP — As Amended
Minority — ONTP**

The Majority of the Committee on Transportation on Bill, "An Act Relating to Initial Motor Vehicle Number Plates." (H. P. 957) (L. D. 1358) reported that the same Ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A (Filing No. 233)

(Signed)

Senators:

ROGERSON of Aroostook
Representatives:

BEYER of Cape Elizabeth
ALLEN of Chelsea
KELLY of Rumford
HERSEY of Ft. Fairfield
STILPHEN of Rockland
TOTMAN of Bangor

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

(Signed)

Senators:

COLE of Waldo
HALL of York

Representative

JACQUES of Lewiston

Comes from the House, Majority Report Accepted, and bill Passed to be Engrossed, as Amended by Committee Amendment A, as amended by House Amendment A thereto — (Filing No. 416)

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Reed of Aroostook, tabled pending consideration of the reports and specially assigned for later in today's session.

Communication

STATE OF MAINE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AUGUSTA

May 20, 1957

Honorable Chester T. Winslow
Secretary of the Senate
98th Legislature

Sir:

The House today voted to adhere to its former action on Bill, "An Act Relating to the Appointment of Clerks of the Judicial Courts by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court." (H. P. 322) (L. D. 439) on which the House had indefinitely postponed both Reports and the Bill, and the Senate Accepted Report "A" and the Bill was Passed to be Engrossed in non-concurrence.

Respectfully,

(Signed) HARVEY R. PEASE
Clerk of the House

Which was read and ordered placed on file.

Second Readers

The Committee on Bills in the Second Reading reported the following bills:

Senate

Bill, "An Act Relating to Construction Reserve Fund in Department of Finance and Administration." (S. P. 442) (L. D. 1260)

Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959." (S. P. 591) (L. D. 1594)

(On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, tabled pending passage to be engrossed and specially assigned for later in today's session.)

Which were read a second time and passed to be engrossed.
Sent down for concurrence.

Enactors

The Committee on Engrossed Bills reported as truly and strictly Engrossed, the following bills and resolves.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Sales of Milk on the Producer's Premises." (H. P. 305) (L. D. 422)

Bill, "An Act Imposing a Tax on Dry Beans." (H. P. 486) (L. D. 730)

Which Bills were passed to be enacted.

Bill, "An Act Relating to Publication of Specimen Ballots, State Financial Reports, Constitutional Amendments and Referendums in Foreign Language Newspapers." (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1445)

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President I move that this bill be tabled.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, a division of the Senate was had.

Ten having voted in the affirmative and twenty-one in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon the bill was passed to be enacted.

Bill, "An Act Classifying Certain Surface Waters in Maine." (H. P. 1085) (L. D. 1562)

(On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, tabled pending passage to be enacted.)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Appointment of Institutional Heads in Department of Institutional Services." (S. P. 186) (L. D. 465)

Bill, "An Act Authorizing the Annexation of Harbor Island to the Town of Brooksville." (S. P. 241) (L. D. 642)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Time Limitations for Filing Petitions Under Workmen's Compensation Act." (S. P. 259) (L. D. 697)

Bill, "An Act Relating to Speed Regulations for Motor Vehicles." (S. P. 573) (L. D. 1576)

"Resolve in Favor of Harmon Rogers of Topsham." (H. P. 594) (L. D. 843)

"Resolve Opening Swan Lake, Waldo County, to Ice Fishing." (H. P. 982) (L. D. 1406)

Which bills were passed to be enacted and the resolves finally passed.

Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first tabled and specially assigned matter being Resolve Authorizing Research of Cystic Fibrosis, a Disease of Children." (H. P. 803) (L. D. 1134) tabled by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Rogerson earlier in today's session, pending consideration of the report.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Rogerson of Aroostook, the ought to pass as amended report was accepted, Committee Amendment A was read and adopted and the resolve as amended was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The President laid before the Senate the second tabled and specially assigned matter being House Reports from the Committee on Transportation: Majority report, ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A; Minority, report, ought not to pass on bill, "An Act Relating to Initial Motor Vehicle Number Plates." (H. P. 957) (L. D. 1358) tabled by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed pending consideration of the reports; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Rogerson.

Mr. ROGERSON of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I move the acceptance of the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee, and in support of that motion I would like to explain the thinking of the majority of the committee in making that recommendation.

In the past the ham radio bill has met opposition from the Secretary of State's office because it seemed it was giving a special group special consideration. They realized that the ham radio operators were not the only group who are interested in having different type license plates. There has been an interest shown by Civil Defense, by the medical doctors, by dentists, by registered nurses, deputy sheriffs and other groups who all want a special recognition in the matter of license plates, and it has been felt in the past that if the ham radio

operators were given special plates then these groups would have to be accommodated later on too. The sponsor of the bill, recognizing that fact and seeing in it an obstacle which would be hard to overcome, decided to put in a bill to enable any group interested in obtaining special license plates to make application on November 1st prior to the time when the license plates were issued, to pay five dollars a year for this special privilege and receive a license plate which had initials on it. He might use his own initials, or if he were a ham radio operator he might use his call letters; if he were a deputy sheriff he might use the initials to indicate that; or in the case of an M.D. or a registered nurse, that could be indicated on this special initial license plate too. The charge of five dollars would adequately reimburse the State. I understand the cost is \$1.50 for a set of plates, and it would leave them a little profit on the deal. This would be for a five-year period, so that over a five-year period there would be \$17.50 approximately, in profit over and above the cost.

The first opposition that was run into by the sponsor, I understand, was that the Secretary of State's office felt that it would present difficulties in the matter of record-keeping. I believe at the the present time that department feels that if such a measure is passed, not more than a thousand people will avail themselves of this opportunity to get special plates, and if that is true then the one thousand different plates wont present any particular hardship. It will accommodate the ham radio operator, it will accommodate all the other groups, and it will be following along with the desires of the ham radio operators; and it seemed to the sponsor and a majority of the committee that here was a reasonable solution of this perennial problem which the legislature always has to deal with. I hope that the Senate will accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President and members of the Senate: As a signer of the minority "Ought not to pass" report, I would like to give you my thinking along that line.

This initial bill, to me, is really opening the door to everyone. Do we want to go that far in allowing everyone to request initials for their plates? First, are we going to have initials enough to take care of all the demands? There may be fifteen or twenty or more who will want "C-A-T" for "Cat," or "D-O-G" for "Dog," or some such letters.

My main objection is this: That we have a five-year plate program, and this comes right in the middle of our second year of our five-year program. It seems to me that this is ill-timed and is certainly not the time now to adopt an initial plate bill. It will require a lot of complications in the department and cross-references. I know that the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Rogerson, says that there may be a thousand, but in my opinion there will be a great many more, and the work in the department will be so heavy and so expensive that I doubt whether this is at all feasible at this time. Mr. President, I hope that the motion of the Senator from Aroostook Senator Rogerson, does not prevail.

Mr. ROGERSON of Aroostook: Mr. President, I neglected to say in my first remarks that the sponsor of the bill had indicated to me that he wanted me to mention the fact that he did not want to jeopardize the ham radio bill, but he does feel that this is opening the door to everybody and that there should not be any special interest groups to whom we should cater. If we do pass the ham bill then certainly at the next session members of other professions and other groups will be in here expecting the same treatment, and justifiably, I think.

The Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, has indicated that there may be a shortage of initials. I believe the bill provides for five initials, and there is almost an innumerable number of combinations which can be made from those five initials.

The matter of who gets which initials would be determined by the Secretary of State's office because application is made on November first prior to the year in which the plates are issued, and it would be on a first come first served basis. I can see no connection between this being in the middle of a five-year

program and this problem, because all that would be necessary if a person makes application for this plate is that the Secretary of State issue him the license plate which he has requested and recall the plate which he currently has. The number of people who might apply, I am told by the sponsor of the bill, has not been arbitrarily set, but I think is based on the number of people who have used such a bill in other states where this legislation has been passed.

Mr. BAILEY of Sagadahoc: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I have had several calls this morning from the police departments in Sagadahoc County and they are very much opposed to this bill passing, and I feel that those people in that department are in a position to study the situation and to give a fair expression of what they feel in regard to the bill as it is set up and can do so better than some of the rest of us; therefore it will be my duty to ask to accept the minority report of this committee.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Rogerson, that the Senate accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: 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 Aroostook, Senator Rogerson, that the Senate accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee, and the Senator from Kennebec, Senator Martin, asks for a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Rogerson, that the Senate accept the majority "Ought to pass" report of the committee will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Eight having voted in the affirmative and twenty-three in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

On motion by the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, the minority "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair at this time is pleased to recognize a group of forty-five students from Gary, with Miss Smith and several gentlemen. On behalf of the Senate the Chair welcomes you here to our session today. We hope you have a fine time and we hope that after the session you will come down and visit with us. Thank you very much for coming. (Applause)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair lays before the Senate the third tabled and specially-assigned matter, Bill, "An Act Making Supplemental Appropriations for the Expenditures of State Government and for Other Purposes for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1958 and June 30, 1959," (S. P. 591) (L. D. 1594) which was tabled earlier in today's session by the Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair, and the Chair recognizes that Senator.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: As I explained yesterday, I would be very happy to go over the Supplemental Appropriation bill today. In order to make it a little clearer, I ask that the pages distribute copies of L. D. 119, which was the original bill and the New Draft, L. D. 1594. That will save going into your two books and jumping from one book to another.

Under L. D. 1594 the first item is that of the Department of Adjutant General, which is not in L. D. 119. I might explain briefly that that particular item has to do with additional requests to provide for an under-estimate of fuel requirements at the various armories. At the time the original request was placed certain items were left out, and in the supplemental bill we have added \$23,100 the first year and \$20,400 the second year.

In the Department of Agriculture you will note there are two items, the Division of Markets and the Soil Conservation Committee. Under the Division of Markets the first item is to provide fifty per cent of the cost of operating the Market News Service in Presque Isle along with the Federal Government. There have been indications in the last two or three years that the Federal government would no longer par-

ticipate in this unless the State shared one-half of the cost, so we have provided for that. For the Soil Conservation Committee it includes an appropriation of \$2000, which is for capital items, three tree-planters, two seeders and one power grader.

The Department of Audit, you will note that the original request has been changed considerably as to purpose. We have before us L. D. 1475, which provides for a more orderly procedure in auditing reports from the various communities to the State Department of Audit. We have recommended an appropriation of \$12,000 for the first year and \$24,000 for the second year to carry out the provisions of this act.

Under Baxter State Park you will note there are Personal Services, All Other and Capital, a line category which has not changed. Personal Services is for additional seasonal park rangers. The All Other is for professional assistance for future planning and operation of State-owned motor vehicles and repairs. The capital item includes 2 new pick-up trucks, 3 new aluminum canoes, and a radio communications set-up between the park and Millinocket.

Under Civil Defense the original bill request was for \$51,020 and \$52,658. That provided for additional area offices. We discussed that with the Civil Defense Department and we have appropriated \$10,385 for the first year and \$10,593 for the second year, which takes care of one Area Director and travel and miscellaneous capital items.

Construction Reserve of \$2,000,000 is a departure from our previous method of appropriating money for capital construction. This is appropriating two million dollars out of our current revenue for much needed construction.

Department of Education, Professional Credits, All Other, \$100,000 in the balanced budget. Experience has shown that the average demand is \$113,150 annually. Under the School Building Authority we have an item of \$2951 which is the one-quarter of one per cent which is now being charged to the communities for the services in regard to the School Building Authority. It is cumbersome and very difficult to

explain, and with the small amount of the appropriation the committee felt that the State could very well take over that function. Under Administration it adds one new Accountant I, and \$530 for a desk, chair and adding machine. Under Farmington State Teachers College, Gorham State Teachers College, Washington State Teachers College, Aroostook State Teachers College and Fort Kent Normal School those supplemental amounts are for new salary schedule for instructors at those colleges as well as new positions at some of the State Teachers Colleges. For example, at Farmington there is one new position or two part-time positions in the new Library - Classroom Building, two new instructors in the campus school and a new math instructor. This is true all the way down through these various teachers colleges. We have taken into consideration the size and demand at the teachers colleges and have made provisions for additional instructors. There is also an item in regard to the unclassified employees, such as janitors, grounds - keepers and so forth. Schooling Children in Unorganized Territory, which is personal services, merely takes in the unclassified personnel there, which would be a number of teachers, bus drivers and so forth. Vocational Education, Personal Services, \$22,345 the first year and \$23,361 for the second year, is in connection with the Practical Nursing School at Waterville, and in connection with that you have All Other items which includes professional fees, travel in and out of the state, Utility service, rents, repairs, insurance, general operating expense, printing bulletins, food, fuel, office supplies and so forth. There is an item of \$1,611 for the first year and \$2,161 for the second year for capital items, which includes desks, ranges, library tables, library chairs, electric mixers, toasters and so forth which go along with that type of instruction.

The Maine Vocational Technical Institute, we have personal services, which allows for one new instructor and an account clerk; and the committee is recommending a new course of Cooking and Baking at the school, which will allow for one new instructor the first year

and an additional instructor the second year. There is a dedicated revenue. We presume that additional students will attend the school for this cooking and baking course, and there will be additional revenue of \$3885 and \$6475, which makes \$7,087 and \$9,099. In connection with the Vocational Technical Institute we also have the All Other items such as professional fees, travel, utility service, repairs, general operating expense and so forth. Additional capital expenditures will be needed in connection with this new school, such as ranges, sinks, mixers and so forth.

Also, continuing with Education, there is Vocational Rehabilitation, and it provides for five Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to work with the mentally-retarded and physically - handicapped. Personal services would take care of that, and the All Other would be grants to individuals for assistance. Federal matching funds will be available in the amount of \$134,000 each year.

Finance and Administration, Bureau of Public Improvements, \$17,693 for the first year and \$18,421 for the second year, takes care of Architectural Aide, Clerk-Stenographer II, Engineering Aide II, and temporary or part-time help. In addition to that the All Other is for additional staff in this Bureau of Public Improvements.

Public Buildings: personal services, all other and capital, which is for the increased maintenance for Capitol Park just across the road from this building. It takes care of part-time seasonal help, \$2000 for repairs and one power mower.

In the Bureau of Purchases, the committee has provided for one Material and Specifications Examiner, one Clerk-Typist I and also to cover transfer of two employees from the Departmental Garage. There have been two employees in that department who have been working entirely on the departmental garage accounts and it is felt that there is a definite need for those people to remain in the Bureau of Purchases. The All Other and the Capital will be necessary for personal services, to provide funds to expand material and specification examination service particularly and to strengthen

the organization of the bureau. Central Mail Room, that takes care of one new personnel and one new postal clerk. Bureau of Taxation, we have provided for additional shelving in the Inheritance Tax Division, which for some reason or other was eliminated in the original request for funds in the new State Office Building.

Department of Forestry, that is to continue the service of the aerial survey that has been going on for the last two bienniums.

Under Health and Welfare we have added the St. Andre's Home and Hospital in Biddeford, feeling that there is an institution that is doing an exceptionally fine piece of work; they have no endowment funds, and we felt that it was very worthy.

I think there is very little further information necessary on Aid to Public and Private Hospitals, \$275,000 each year, which, as you know, should help to assist the hospitals and the so-called paying patients who are carrying the burden which rightfully belongs to the entire State for service to the medically indigent.

Alcoholic Rehabilitation, the committee felt that this was a very fine program and should be continued. Where they now have a director and an assistant we have added under Personal Services one additional clerical help and two counselors. They need some additional All Other and a small amount of Capital.

Board and Care of Neglected Children, we have established \$150,000 each year to provide for increased payment to foster homes. The amount of money being paid to these foster homes has been in the neighborhood of an average of, I believe, around \$32.35 a month, and this will make provision for the payment of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$39 a month.

Bureau of Health, in the All Other category we have made provision for \$5000 each year for the purchase of polio vaccine, and an additional \$1000 for X-ray film for case-finding purposes.

Under Old Age Assistance we have recommended \$182,600 for the first year and \$249,196 for the second year to put into effect the revised

table of expected contributions from legally responsible relatives, feeling that the need for assistance in Old Age is very great. The committee felt that by working out this new table which the Committee on Welfare, under the direction of the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Reed, presented, would be a very fine program and would be of great assistance to Old Age.

Eliminating Citizenship Requirement figures \$75,000 and \$85,000 for each year of the biennium.

Aid to the Blind and Aid to the Disabled goes along with the revised table that was worked out with the Department and the Committee on Welfare. Nursing Home Care for the Aged, the Blind, the Disabled and Dependent Children, we recommended \$500,000 each year to provide improved standards of care in nursing homes for persons in these four categories, and this will reduce the State Appropriation for General Relief by \$12,500 each year.

I might say that under the Elimination of Citizenship Requirement the general program will be reduced by \$5000 each year, which will show up at the end of the bill where we have made a deduction of \$17,500 from the figure you have for Health and Welfare.

Aid to Dependent Children, we recommended \$50,000 each year, which will be matched by federal funds in an equal amount. That could be used for a medical care program for aid to dependent children. That is a program which we do not now have. It will be a limited program, but, feeling that it is a very worthwhile program, the committee has recommended \$50,000 each year to commence that program of medical care.

In the Institutional Service, at both the Augusta State Hospital and the Bangor State Hospital the committee recommended an appropriation for an Out-patient Division. We feel that many cases could be taken care of without being institutionalized if such a service was made available. The committee endorses that program for out-patient service, which of course would require All Other funds as well as additional Capital funds.

Pownal State School, the committee recommended \$175,509 the first

year and \$183,931 for the second year for additional personnel. That is the equivalent of about 69 or 70 additional persons to be used at Pownal State School, which of course would be entirely administrative. I have a long list of the requests and what the Appropriations Committee felt would be a great addition to the school. In the All Other category we recommended \$15,000 each year for commodities for these extra persons.

State School for Boys, Personal Services, the committee has recommended ten additional members to the staff, Clerk Stenographer 1, three stationary firemen to replace boys who have been operating the boilers at the school, Houseparent II, Psychologist II, a psychiatric social worker, a teacher, vocational trades instructor and a recreational supervisor.

\$15,000 the first year and \$10,000 the second year is for miscellaneous needed equipment.

Reformatory for Men, Personal Services include a correctional officer for both years and an additional correctional officer for the second year.

Under Maine State Prison, the committee makes provision for fifteen additional personnel; ten guards, two chaplains, two elementary teachers and one barber instructor, and in the All Other category \$7966 which would be for those additional personnel. \$3000 of the \$7966 is for the transfer of two inmates to Federal institutions, on which the State has to pay \$4966.

Library, under personal services it provides for one additional Librarian II and also for a Library Assistant. All Other is operating Bookmobile and equipment and so on.

Maine Maritime Academy, the committee recommended \$15,000 each year to assist in the increased cost of operation.

Maine Port Authority, to further promote the facilities of the Maine Port Authority the committee recommended \$12,000 each year.

Municipal Sewage, the committee is recommending \$418,000 each year for the State to go along with matching funds that will be available to the extent of \$627,000 from the federal government. Municipal funds

would come to \$1,045,000. We will use this \$418,000 recommended by the committee, with the State paying to carry on an approximate \$2,000,000 program.

Department of Personnel, there has been considerable criticism in regard to applicants having to make application or coming to the Department of Personnel to apply for jobs and finding that they will have to come back again at some later date to take the examination. This Personal Services, \$5,883 for the first year and \$6,268 for the second year, will make it possible to have a continuous recruitment program. It includes a Personnel Technician II and a Clerk Typist I, and Capital would take care of equipment for the additional personnel.

Salary Plan, \$943,959 each year to provide funds to implement the recommendations of the Public Administration Service in regard to Salary Plan No. 1.

Sea and Shore Fisheries the committee recommended a \$10,000 appropriation to provide for a patrol boat in place of one that was burned and which was originally requested to be replaced even before it was burned. We had a number of figures presented to us. There is \$2500 available in the department from the insurance on the boat that was burned, which would make a \$12,500 appropriation.

University of Maine, the All Other category provides for increased enrollment and increased operating costs recommended in the supplemental budget. The additional \$9000 additional that we have recommended is to take care of one research scientist who worked in the animal pathology building at the University of Maine, because it would appear that the University of Maine is going to lose funds because of the fact they are no longer producing the vaccine which they were selling to the poultry farmers. They can no longer produce that and they would still like to retain this research scientist in the animal pathology program.

Under Veterans Affairs we have recommended an \$800 appropriation each year to take care primarily of an office in Portland where there is danger that they may have to

seek new quarters. There is a possibility that they may not have to, but we felt, in view of that possibility, it would be well to include a small appropriation to take care of that emergency.

Under the Water Improvement Commission we have recommended \$25,000 each year to provide for technical and enforcement staff as needed, and to provide consulting and planning services for cities and towns.

Mr. President, I believe that covers the report on the Supplemental Appropriation. If there are any questions I would be very happy to attempt to clarify anything that any of the Senators may have in regard to this. So that there may be a motion before the Senate, I will move that the bill be given its second reading.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair, that the bill be passed to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The motion prevailed and the bill was passed to be engrossed and sent down for concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair is very pleased to note the presence in the Senate Chamber of two groups of youngsters from Rumford, part of them are from the new Virginia School and part of them from the Bisbee School. On behalf of the Senate, we welcome all of you youngsters and we will do everything we can to make your day a pleasant one. We all thank you for coming. (Applause)

The PRESIDENT: The Senate is proceeding under Orders of the Day.

Previously this Senate has given unanimous consent to the sending of engrossed bills that each of the two branches are in concurrence on to the engrossing department. As a result of this morning's action of the Senate we have nine bills that could go to the engrossing department, Geological Survey, Dogs running at large, Travel by Inspectors, Eradication of Aquatic Weeds, Study of the Uninsured Motorist, Forestry Rehabilitation, Medical and Dental Education, and a big bill relating

to General Laws Relating to Municipalities, Validation of Certain Instruments, and Research on Cystic Fibrosis. Is there unanimous consent that this group of bills be sent to the engrossing department? The Chair hears no objection.

On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, the Senate voted to take from the table, Bill, "An Act Classifying Certain Surface Waters in Maine," (H. P. 1085) (L. D. 1562) which was tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session, pending passage to be enacted.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the privilege of tabling this item and I now move its enactment.

Thereupon the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Curtis of Cumberland, the Senate voted to reconsider its action taken earlier in today's session whereby it accepted the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee on "Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey," (H. P. 588) (L. D. 837)

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, I shall move that we concur with the House in substituting the bill for the "Ought not to pass" report, and I would like to address a few remarks to you concerning this matter to be sure that you understand thoroughly what is involved in this measure.

As the title of the bill indicates, "Resolve Authorizing Forestry Resource Survey", it has been felt for a long time that it was to our advantage to find out just what we have for forest resources. I believe that there is very definitely a need in this State for us to look at all of our resources, whatever they may be. For every move forward we find that competition is extremely intense between all the states in the United States for business, and of course you know we all rest secure on the soundness of the economy of our state and its citizens.

Now we have just a few natural resources to put into the economic market of the country. One of them, of course, is land; another is water power, and so on. One of the greatest is our forest resource, and yet when you start to dig into it you

find that we are woefully ignorant of what we actually have. There are some seventeen million acres of forest lands in this State, and we know so very little about it that many times when inquiries come into our Department of Economic Development they find that they cannot answer many of the questions that need to be answered if we are to attract new industry and if we are to properly develop our resources. At the present time I think it is fair to say that we have for too many years ignored a resource which can mean a great deal to every one of our citizens. There is no essential scientific data, for example, on the size, composition or disposition of our forest resources. That is a staggering thought, for we have something God-given which we have such little information about that apparently day in and day out we waste and ignore something which could be a tremendous asset to the State.

Our forest resources, as we know, are very liable to intense economic loss, and part of that loss comes from inaccessibility of our forest land; we just can't get in to it and we do not know what we have got after we get in there. Something should be done about that and some thought should be given to it. Also, if you will, we have a case here of perhaps under-exploitation of our forest industry and our forest resources. There is a need for a reasonable estimate of the extent of obsolescence of our forest resources. We have no accurate figures to tell us what we are using as far as this natural resource is concerned. In this day and age there is a terrific need for wood use research where we explore fully all of the various new methods that have been found and are constantly coming on the market for using wood products. It is the feeling of many of our experts in this State that we have missed the boat when it comes to actually using all of our woods as they could be used with the new techniques. Actually it should be stepped up considerably if we are going to just keep up with the other states, because from everything we can get, those of us who are interested in this, states with far less forestry resources than we

have are ahead of us when it comes to this particular phase of the industry, and they are capitalizing on our weakness. I think there is a very definite need for accurate data on forest resources in order for us to lay long-range plans for development and conservation and management of this natural resource.

Now, gentlemen, I hope you do not think that I am just mouthing words here. I feel very strongly about this because I recognize that we in Maine have a hard fight in the years ahead and we cannot afford to overlook any of our resources. As some of you know, I have fought long and hard for an expansion of our geology program so that we would know what our mineral wealth know what our mineral py to say that we are beginning to move along that line, and it will not be too many years before we will be able to answer the queries coming in and be able to tell the world what we have for mineral resources. But lo and behold, I find that our forest resources are just about as bad. We know so little about them, and yet they could be a major factor in the economic life of this State.

Now this bill is so simple it is awfully hard for me to understand how anybody could be against it. I do not know whether it is because you are not familiar with the bill and what it says and what it hopes to do, or whether you suspect there is some boogey-man hiding behind the scenes and that perhaps there are some things here we have to be frightened of. Now I cannot quite follow that line of reasoning that says we have to be careful about finding out what we have got. Yes, there may be some skeletons in the closet, but I do not think that those who introduced the bill had that in mind. It is to survey the size, composition and disposition of our forest resources — it is as simple as that — by the use of an impartial outside agency at a cost of \$25,000. Some say that it is not enough. Well, maybe it is not enough but it is a start, and the survey may show us that perhaps we may have to appropriate more in order to find out more about what we have. I do not see anything wrong with that. At least it is a start. There are some who say that it is too much. Well, if

it is too much we will have to leave that to the Governor and Council to see to it that it is not too much. I rely on their judgment to cut corners if need be.

This particular survey is the result of another survey which we just had, and although our batting average is pretty low when it comes to accepting the recommendations of the PAS report, I think we could very seriously look at this one. The PAS report came up with a conclusion that a survey such as this should be made, and then a citizens committee was formed to look over the PAS recommendations and they came up with the same recommendation. This bill is the result of the PAS survey recommendation and the citizens' committee recommendation, and when we turn this bill down we are flying in the face of that kind of expert advice, which I think is dangerous to do if we have the welfare of the State and its citizens at heart.

No such study as this has ever been made in the State to my knowledge. We have toyed with a little bit, we have used our resources indiscriminately and wastefully, and we have now reached the time when we must give some good, common-sense hard looks at it, if you will. The new uses of wood products force us into this kind of a survey, I feel very definitely. We have to find out more and better ways to use our forest lands and our forest products. We must try to obtain more production because it is a valuable crop for us; and at the same time we should try to improve our methods of curbing waste, for many of our waste products could be used if proper research were given to it and the details worked out. There is a fast-growing demand, for example — and this is a by-product — for recreational areas. We are competing with every other state in the United States for recreational dollars, and here is a chance for us to give a good look at our forest resources, and we might come up with another Baxter State Park. We could come up with some recreational areas that might be the best use for this particular land, and as every one of you know, we must move and move rapidly along that line if we

are to maintain our position, let alone go ahead.

There is another area that I think a lot of people shy away from, and there again I don't know why, and that is taxes. Yes, this survey is going to look into our forest land taxes. There have been grumblings for many years that our forest lands are under-taxed, that people have been getting away with all kinds of things and putting one over on the people of the State of Maine. I am not ready to buy that at all. I think this is a perfect way to put that at rest. Let's look at our tax situation with forest lands and find out if taxes are equitable and are adequate and if it is a fair taxation system. This survey will only try to determine what the system is and how it stacks up.

So I say in conclusion that this \$25,000 beside the ten million dollars we just voted on like that, might be a very good investment in Maine's future, and I honestly do not see how we can turn down anything that could be as fruitful as this one the basis that we do not need it or it is not worth it or let's forget it for a while. Today is the day to act and now is the time and here is the bill. I urge you to accept the substitution of the bill for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in defense of the committee report. The committee studied this very carefully. There is a survey being conducted at the present time, according to my understanding, by the Federal Forestry Service that has been going on for a couple of years or three years. I understand that it will take another two or three years to complete. It is going to cost in the neighborhood of \$250,000 when it is completed. That is Federal funds, and it is being done by the United States Forestry Service.

The good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, has stated that this is a recommendation of the PAS and the citizens' committee. At the hearing on this bill there seemed to be some confusion as to just what this bill was supposed to do. I call your attention to the bill and the many ramifications of it, or the

many segments that shall be studied under this particular bill. It was the committee's feeling that \$25,000 would not begin to do the job. As I said, there was some confusion. At least one member of the citizens' committee who appeared thought in terms of a report that could be made available to the extent of \$25,000 would be sufficient. That report covered many of the things suggested by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis; but many of these things are already available in the Forestry Department and from many other sources.

Just some of the things that this bill, L. D. 837, asks for are: That a general survey be made of the size, composition and disposition of such resources; the survey shall appraise, evaluate and provide accurate estimates of all mature forest growth, including determinable rates of obsolescence of such growth based on over-age, blowdowns and insect damage; further such survey shall determine through appropriate means present economic losses resulting from factors of inaccessibility and under-exploitation; the survey shall include but not be limited to consideration of conservation measures consistent with economic development of the resource and briefly report on the Tree Farm system of selective cutting, etc. The study shall investigate those sections of the Maine Forestry District heavily dominated by waterways, lakes and mountains, and so forth. Such study shall include an appraisal of current local and state methods of taxation of state-forested lands and the total annual collection of such state taxes and their use, together with accurate estimates of the annual per-care tax liability of forested lands in the Maine Forestry District. The study shall examine and consider the matter of severance taxes in states having large forest resources, the amount of state taxes collected and how used, making a detailed analysis and evaluation of the New Hampshire State Forestry severance tax. The study shall evaluate the present activities of the forestry department and the University of Maine, etc. There are many, many segments of this bill, and the com-

mittee felt that if it were enacted it never could be accomplished with a \$25,000 appropriation.

Now because of the fact that there is, as I understand, a study being made by the United States Forestry Service and that study is going on now, it did not seem to the committee that it was necessary at this time to approve this bill. There have been a number of studies made before. About ten years ago a study was made by a group of citizens who were interested in just such things as the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, has submitted, and that committee worked without compensation. The State did pay for the printing of the report, as I understand it.

I would hope that the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, does not prevail.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, I hate to take issue with the good Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair, because I know his sincerity and his honesty and integrity is of the highest, but I would just like to point out a couple of things.

In the first place, I think that the feeling of the people who drafted this bill was that rather than to say, "Let's have a survey of forestry resources in Maine, appropriate \$25,000 and let the Governor appoint a group to go out and do it," leaving it as broad as that, they would try to tie down some of the areas that have been in dispute and some of the areas that we really know very little about.

As I count them, there are some nine areas specifically spelled out. Now that is a big hunk of survey; there is no question in anybody's mind about that. But the resolve had that in mind and went on to say that all State officers and employees be directed to cooperate fully with the staff in making the general survey of state forestry resources and to afford to them access to all necessary records and reports.

That, as I interpret it, means that if one of these areas has already been surveyed and all the information available, that all they have to do is just take it, look it over, agree with it, and that is it. But that is one area that has been in dispute,

one area of problem regarding our problem of forestry resources which is being taken care of. We do not necessarily have to have the one survey group do all nine surveys. Also that the Governor employ an organization well-qualified to do such work—I think until such time as the Governor and Council look this over and decide that there are certain areas with plenty of information available, then this organization needs only to look into one, two or three. It also says that the Governor may be authorized to appoint such committees as may be necessary to cooperate in the preparation of such a general state survey, and it goes on to say such committees would include members of the legislature and representatives of the public generally. I think they intended to save some money that way. It could very well be that a committee could be appointed to handle one area and another committee another area and another committee another area, and another committee another area.

As I visualize it, this survey is set up to go into nine specific areas regarding our forest resources. The \$25,000 is to cover the employment of a private agency to look into such areas as we do not have complete information on. That committee can go to work on the other areas and come up with their recommendations, and it may very well be that out of this \$25,000 survey there will come a recommendation to spend more money and survey some more, but at least we would be started along the road and some answers would be gained and some of these nine major problem areas would have answers to them. I think that is the intent of it, and I feel that for \$25,000 invested in Maine's future we cannot go wrong. I hope the motion does prevail.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis. I have the feeling that the Committee on Appropriations were not so much opposed to this philosophy of having a study of this, our perhaps second most valuable natural resource, as they

were in question as to what the survey might accomplish. My feeling from the outset has been that the effort here would be to compile and bring together all the valuable information contained in the act for the benefit of this Maine legislature or future Maine legislatures. I think that we need this forest survey. I think perhaps the principle question is: Are we usurping our forest resources, thus endangering their future, for our immediate gain. The chainsaws are sweeping through our forests like a plague of locusts; the bulldozers are tearing up our wilderness streams, perhaps sometimes in pursuit of immediate gain without thought to the value and urgency of retaining these valuable resources for the use and benefit of future generations.

These acts, it is needless to mention here, have a direct and drastic effect upon other valuable resources, such as our surface waters and the level of our surface waters and underground water supply.

I feel that if the federal government can complete any kind of a satisfactory survey of forestry resources for \$250,000 that perhaps with the modest sum of \$25,000 we can bring before our legislative body a survey that would be of great interest and importance to us. Thank you.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I rise in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis. I think that the Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair, has covered it very well, but I want to go on record as being opposed to this act. I do not believe there is any need for such a survey at this time. I think if the Forestry Department in Augusta wants to get some information they can certainly refer it to the citizens in the various towns throughout the State and that information is available.

Speaking of the waste, I cannot imagine any concern going in and leaving a lot of unused wood that is usable in the forest. I also do not agree with him on the tax angle of it. I am an assessor myself and we know practically every acre of land in our town and we assess and tax it according to what we find there.

I certainly hope that the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, does not prevail.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I just want to speak of one additional item. The Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, has said it could very well call for additional money. It was the feeling of the Appropriations Committee that that was exactly what would happen, and inasmuch as there is a survey and study being conducted at the present time by the United States Forestry Service, to what extent I cannot say frankly and honestly, but I have the word of the Commissioner of Forestry that that survey and study is going on and will take another couple of years to complete and is going to cost in the neighborhood of \$250,000.

Now if there are eight or nine segments that need to be studied, why should we not wait until after we have the complete report from the United States Forestry Service, and then if we want to go into a particular segment go into that particular segment for further study, which probably would be accomplished within the \$25,000. But who would know but what we would start out duplicating the efforts or digging up material that is already being studied and the report on which we will get in a very few short years. I merely raise that point, and I request a division.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, that the Senate substitute the bill for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President, just one final answer to the remarks of the Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair.

The government survey, as I understand it, is relatively limited and will not cover many of these areas. It would be pretty obvious. I think to this committee or group that they ought to consult the government and find out what area they are surveying so they would not duplicate it. That would be the first thing.

I would point out that this is exactly what is happening with geology. The government has been surveying Maine for the last four or five years and will continue for an-

other four or five, and our geology department is cooperating completely with the government, and the area the government is surveying they stay out of and they develop their own areas. This, of course, would be exactly the same thing. My question is: Can we afford to wait two years? Why not do it now when it needs to be done?

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, that the resolve be substituted for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee. The Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair, has asked for a division.

As many as are in favor of the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Curtis, that the Senate substitute the resolve for the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee will rise and stand until counted.

A division was had.

Seven having voted in the affirmative and twenty-five in the negative, the motion did not prevail.

On motion by Mr. Sinclair of Somerset, the "Ought not to pass" report of the committee was accepted in non-concurrence.

RECESS

Called to order by the President.

On motion of Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin the Senate voted to reconsider its action taken in this morning's session whereby it passed to be enacted Bill "An Act Relating to Publication of Specimen Ballots, State Financial Reports, Constitutional Amendments and Referendum in Foreign Language Newspapers," (H. P. 1015) (L. D. 1445).

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President I now move that this bill and accompanying papers be laid on the table under the name of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Butler.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Boucher, moves that the bill and accompanying papers be laid on the table pending passage to be enacted and the same Senator asks unanimous consent that the tabling be under the name of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Butler. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The motion prevailed and the bill was so tabled.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, recessed until 1:30 p.m.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Dow of Lincoln, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game: Majority report, ought to pass; Minority report, ought not to pass, on "Resolve Regulating Fishing in Rangeley River, Franklin County." (H. P. 112) (L. D. 150) tabled by that Senator on May 17 pending consideration of the reports; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson.

Mr. FERGUSON of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this bill regulates fishing in Rangeley River in Franklin County and I have supported it from the very beginning. I feel after talking to a good many people from up in that area that we should go along with this bill. The question has come up before and has been discussed very thoroughly pro and con as to the damage done to the salmon on a river going through their spawning beds. I feel that we should bend somewhat to the wishes of the people in that particular area inasmuch as it does apply to fishing for a few days for some of the tourists to come into the area and it is sportsman's paradise up in that section. I hope that the Senate will go along with the majority report of the committee, the ought to pass report. I understand that motion is in order, and I so move.

Mr. CARPENTER of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I must oppose the motion of the good Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson and I will make a few brief statements. We have been all over this Rangeley River deal for some weeks. Two years ago we had on our committee as a member of the Inland Fish and Game Committee, a gentleman from Rangeley and at that particular time when this river was closed to those last fifteen days of fishing, it apparently

met with his approval. He is an owner of a sporting camp, one of the oldest sporting camps in Rangeley.

This is definitely a spawning river and if we set up legislation such as this, it will be special legislation for a special county on a special river that no other rivers enjoy. I hope the motion of the Senator from Oxford does not prevail.

Mr. BOUCHER of Androscoggin: Mr. President and members of the Senate I would like to point out that this not an exception; under the fishing laws there are at least two rivers in Kennebec County and two or three in Oxford County which have permission to fish until September 30. I have a copy of the fishing laws of the state and the outlet of Kennebago Lake is open until the 30th day of September. That is in Oxford County. In Kennebec County, Belgrade Stream and Cobbossee Stream are open to September 30 and so we are not passing a law that would be a special privilege for one river in the state.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate: All of you have been disturbed, I believe, over the extensive references that are continually made in this legislature to the regulations for fishing and game matters. Now this problem will continue to exist just as long as we are going to allow these regulations to be defined by members of the legislature. A few years ago this Body had the wisdom, I believe, to remove all of the road resolves from legislative review and I think most of us are well pleased with the results and I think that one day we will see the wisdom of placing special fishing regulations in the hands of those best qualified to rule upon them and stop this sectional request for various regulations of their own. Now it seems unusual to me that they would always find this area in fish and game matters or matters pertaining to our wild life to come in and make these particular requests. I feel sure that were one county to request a maximum speed limit than another or a higher or lower maximum weight tolerance limit than another, or were Aroostook County or Franklin County to request that they be allowed to sell

beer on Sunday, just one can of beer that is, and perhaps limit it only to men in pink sweaters, it wouldn't be accepted. And I can't see why these conservation matters are any more acceptable just because there is a particular group from some area that wants to make the regulations to suit irregardless of whether conservation suffers.

I think the members of the Senate will allow me just briefly to refer once more to the extensive report that was done for the Department of Fish and Game by the Wildlife Management Institute. In this report, on page 21, I am pleased to say that this very favorable comment regarding the value of our fishery technicians and their program results, and I quote: "The department has reason to be proud of the quality and ability of its fishery technicians and the program they are advocating." Now the question here is in my way of thinking, will we show our gratitude for this quality and for the hard work that is being done by these folks by reputing the program which they believe are in the interest of conservation of our fish and wild life. Heading our fishing division as chief is one Dr. Harry Everhart of Orono. Dr. Everhart I believe is one of the foremost young fishery technicians in the world today. I have a telegram from Dr. Everhart on this particular matter; and I quote: "Data gathered state wide by the fishery division prove conclusively that salmon and trout begin to gather in concentration the first part of September and move on the spawning beds throughout the remainder of the month. The fish are most vulnerable to the angler during the spawning period. If the regulation to protect the spawning runs of our falmonid fishes cannot be justified, there is little excuse for any of our fishery regulations. The fish and game department consider the spawning fish of tremendous importance and in one area alone, Rangeley River, is spending \$25,000 this year for a fishway to provide access to and from this spawning area."

Now I hope that out of what I have said or my colleague the Senator from Somerset, Senator Carpenter has said, who is himself the Chairman of the Committee will not

result in any feeling of any personal thinking in this matter whatsoever. We are just standing here and sounding a plea for what we believe is good conservation practice and I don't believe if we are going to allow these regulations to keep piling up on the books, and especially as they apply to our allowing fishing for our spawning run fish, that we are going to serve that purpose and I sincerely hope that you will vote to defeat the motion of Senator Ferguson of Oxford.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate, continually I have voted for this bill and I am not interested in the fishing business. I am not a fishing enthusiast. I have never been to Rangeley Lakes in my life and never knew that my name would get the publicity it has. I have been getting mail and telegrams and I do hope that now once and for all we will follow the motion of the Senator from Oxford County, Senator Ferguson and see that this bill goes back to where it belongs in Rangeley Lakes.

Mr. FERGUSON: Mr. President when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President, true this is what seems to be on its face, a small fishing bill. On its face, you would say, "Why should we be concerned with something up in Franklin County for a river?" But let's forget the face. Let's look at the principle behind it. Fundamentally we are sent down here to improve, to codify, to make laws. At the same time we are sent down here to represent our constituents and to try to make laws which we feel will be beneficial to those constituents.

Now, this to me is where we are saying, "Nevermind the district; nevermind sending anybody down here. We know how to govern things. We know how to do things. We have a commission here. The commission will tell us the thing to do. It may be the very best thing. We don't know enough. We have the commission to give us that thought. We are here on a principle. And what is the principle for; the sex life of a fish? That's what it is. It is also a principle of what we are seeking to do. Are we representatives? Are we leaders or are we

followers? In carrying this same principle through, there is no need for us to deliberate upon anything but for the purpose of having a commission and then letting the commission sink. Now those of us in Franklin County are well aware over a long study of what we feel is right and beneficial and so we ask and I stand in support of the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson and I would trust that when the vote is taken you will allow us in that section to govern ourselves as we feel is best for our own interests.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I had no intention of speaking on this bill. However, I believe there is principle involved here, similar to one that will be coming up later, and that is that it is my honest belief that a law, a regulation that is working well in any of our counties, particularly on fishing or hunting that the representatives and senators from those counties should certainly be well qualified to know what is wanted and what works best in those counties. I understand that up until two years ago the fishing law on Rangeley River allowed exactly what they are asking today. And that the fishing has always been excellent there and those from that area would like to have it left as it was prior to two years ago. We have the same situation on bear bounties up in my end of the state. I certainly believe that principle is involved exactly the same in this bill that we have here. Mr. President, I am going along with the thinking of my colleague, Senator Ferguson of Oxford.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I would like if necessary, to remind the members of the Senate, that the only principle that is involved here is that each of us do what he honestly and sincerely believes is right. In this case, some of us are taking the position that this approximately two million dollars worth of license sales are worthy in our state of very careful regulation, and that politics so far as possible should be completely removed from this regulation. I would like too, to remind the members of the Senate that we have defeated

three similar requests already and have in effect twice defeated this request.

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oxford, Senator Ferguson, that the Senate accept the ought to pass report; and that Senator has requested a division.

A division of the Senate was had. Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and eleven opposed, the motion prevailed and under suspension of the rules, the resolve was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair at this time would ask that the following Senators rise: Senators: Lord of Cumberland, Woodcock of Penobscot, Hillman of Penobscot, Fournier of York, Farley of York, Hall of York, Carpenter of Somerset, St. Pierre of Androscoggin, Lessard of Androscoggin, Boucher of Androscoggin, Martin of Kennebec, Silsby of Hancock, Brown of Washington, Wyman of Washington, Cole of Waldo, Parker of Piscataquis, Low of Knox and Dow of Oxford.

On behalf of the Senate we welcome to our procedure today a group of students from Beals Island. I thought it fitting and proper that you youngsters have a look at those Senators who at the last session helped you to realize a dream that your parents and grandparents had in making possible the Beales Bridge. Each one of us will pledge to you our attention the rest of the day and we hope that among you will be some who aspire to serve in this legislature some time in the future. I have asked only those members to rise who were members of the Senate last year. A substantial number of those who have not risen were members of the House and they too joined in making that venture possible. Thank you for coming.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on State Government: ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Powers and Duties of State Board of Barbers and Hairdressers." (S. P. 457) (L.

D. 1305) tabled by that Senator on April 30 pending consideration of the report; and on motion by that Senator, the bill was substituted for the report and read once.

Mr. Wyman of Washington presented Senate Amendment A which was read and adopted.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President, am I in order to debate?

The PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington, Senator Wyman to assign the bill for second reading on the next legislative day. The motion is debatable.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would like at this time to remind those who were present at the public hearing held before the committee that there were some two or three hundred barbers present who opposed this bill. I have talked with many of them since then and they have advised me that they suspect that a proposed amendment would be offered and they instructed me to oppose it vigorously. The arguments are almost unanimously opposed to the bill and I understand that the committee came out with a unanimous ought not to pass vote. In view of the fact that so many barbers have opposed this bill and also of the report that was delivered by the committee, I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WYMAN of Washington: Mr. President and members of the Senate, the barbers did oppose the bill. I had a consultation with the representatives of the barbers and the hairdressers and I would like to speak in opposition to the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Sen. Charles.

This bill is an attempt to carry out what appears to be one of the most important principles of the PAS report; namely that the authority to make rules and regulations with the force of law shall be located here in the capitol and not in boards whose members are scattered over the state and who can almost never be found here in the state house.

As the bill was originally drawn, it had numerous defects which were brought to my attention by the legislative agents for the barbers and

hair dressers. As a result of the conference with these representatives, a proposed redraft was drawn which incorporates the various suggestions made by them and other interested persons. This suggested redraft however, provided that the Board be advisory to the Department of Health and Welfare and not be the final authority. On this account the legislative agents of these two groups would not approve it.

As the PAS report states there are too many special interest groups which are making rules and regulations for their own members without regard to the public. Since this authority as constituted cannot be centered in the state house, when rules and regulations which seem ill advised, are made, it is difficult to come to Augusta and find anyone in authority with whom these rules can be discussed.

In short, the authority as constituted is well insulated from the public.

Therefore it is my sincere hope you will support my position to oppose the motion to indefinitely postponed made by Senator Charles of Cumberland. This amendment as drawn provides for striking out the objectionable features in the original draft and substituting therefore all the changes suggested by the legislative agents of the two groups involved, with one exception; namely that which provides that the rules and regulations made with the force of law are to be in the Department of Health and Welfare, which department instead of representing special interests as does the Board, represents all people in the State of Maine and is located here at the capitol and always available to consider the problems of the people. The Board would be continued but continued in an advisory capacity to the department.

That, members of the Senate, seems to be the principal difference. The legislative agents for the barbers and hairdressers object to having the authority to make rules and regulations centered here in the statehouse. Otherwise the bill has been drawn and amended to take care of all of the suggestions which they made and I therefore hope that the Senate will go along and support

my opposition to the motion of Senator Charles of Cumberland that this bill be indefinitely postponed because I think it is one of the important things of the PAS report, that such authority be centered here in the statehouse and at the time of the hearing the barbers were opposing the bill as originally written and I think the only difference between them and me is on the question of whether this Board shall be advisory or whether it shall be the final authority.

Mr. CHARLES of Cumberland: Mr. President, I want to be very courteous to my friend from Washington County, Senator Wyman and due to the fact that he has just presented this amendment this afternoon, I believe we should have an opportunity to take a look at it and I would like very much to table the motion until tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the bill was laid upon the table pending that Senator's motion to indefinitely postpone.

On motion by Mr. Ferguson of Oxford, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Retirements and Pensions: Majority report, ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A; Minority report ought not to pass, on recommitted "Resolve Providing for State Pension for Beverly Ann Archer of Rumford." (H. P. 56) (L. D. 68) tabled by that Senator on May 10 pending motion by Senator Davis of Cumberland for acceptance of the minority report.

Mr. Ferguson of Oxford: Mr. President and members of the Senate this resolve with Committee Amendment A reduces the original resolve from \$50 per month to \$35 which, in substance, is \$1.15 a day. I realize the position of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis has taken and I certainly respect his stand. This is the only resolve that we from Oxford County are asking for during this session and I think that the Senate should know something of the background of this pension so they can act on it intelligently.

This is rather an unusual situation. Beverly Ann Archer is a twin, eight years old and has cerebral

palsy of the worst kind. Her twin sister is deaf and there are other children in the family. The father is a common laborer and is working very hard to make both ends meet and to keep the family together. By working a great deal of overtime, he has been able to do just that. His family doctor claims that the father is at the breaking point because of working so many hours at the mill trying to provide the necessary medicines and medical treatments for the twins. He has to take both children to different clinics around the state and the cost is terrific.

Mr. President and members of the Senate, isn't it better for us to go along with this pension for \$35 a month and save the state several hundred dollars a month if these children are placed in an institution or if the father breaks down and cannot take care of his family? If he breaks down and cannot take care of them, the children would become eligible for aid to dependent children which would cost the state a great deal of money.

Some remarks have been made as to Rumford's responsibility in this case. This man is proud and industrious. He doesn't want to become a pauper and I do not believe the members of the Senate want to pauperize this family. We, as members of the legislature are not sent down here to pauperize. We are sent down here to try to solve their problems and I certainly feel that this would be solving a problem for this family and many others perhaps like them who are in the same position. I certainly hope that the motion of Senator Davis for the acceptance of the ought not to pass report of the committee does not prevail.

Mr. DAVIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, your Committee on Retirements and Pensions considered this resolve very carefully and the original was reported out unanimously ought not to pass. Later someone recommitted the resolve and a few of the members changed their thinking on it. To my mind this case is strictly a local relief problem in Rumford. When I consider the large industry that they have in Rumford and the size of the payrolls there, I think

we are being very unfair to a large number of smaller and less fortunate towns who are assuming one hundred percent of their relief load and are not asking the state to assume any part of it. I hope you will support my motion.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis, that the Senate accept the minority ought not to pass report.

Mr. FERGUSON: Mr. President when the vote is taken I ask for a division.

A division of the Senate was had. Twelve having voted in the affirmative and seventeen opposed, the motion did not prevail.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Ferguson the ought to pass as amended report was accepted and the resolve read once. Committee Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules, the resolve was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Liquor Control: Majority report, ought not to pass; Minority report, ought to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Obstructions in Windows of Liquor Licensed Premises." (H. P. 430) (L. D. 606) tabled by that Senator on May 17 pending motion by Senator Carpenter of Somerset to accept the ought not to pass report; and Senator Boucher of Androscoggin yielded to the Senator from Somerset, Senator Carpenter.

Thereupon, the Senator from Somerset, Senator Carpenter was granted unanimous consent to withdraw his motion to accept the ought not to pass report and on motion by the same Senator the ought to pass report of the committee was accepted and the bill read once.

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

Which amendment was read and adopted; House Amendment A as amended by Senate Amendment A was adopted; and under suspension

of the rules, the bill as amended was given its second reading and passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Carpenter of Somerset, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game: Majority report, ought to pass as amended with Committee Amendment "B"; Minority report, ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Bounty on Bears" (H. P. 159) (L. D. 206) tabled by that Senator on April 26 pending consideration of the reports.

Mr. CARPENTER of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Senate, our present bounty system provides for \$15 to be paid upon each bear killed. These funds come from the dog tax and any excess reverts back to the towns. If this bill is defeated—and I will consequently make a motion for indefinite postponement—it will leave the bounty on bears. Consequently it will save the state some twelve to fourteen thousand dollars each year.

Research has proven that the bounty system is not a solution to the control of the predator. Let us for instance take a look at the analysis of the stomachs of the bear which have been made in the spring of the year and find out just exactly what their appetite is.

On fourteen stomachs that were analyzed it showed a vegetable matter of some 59.1 per cent. Animal matter was some 33 per cent. Insects and so forth some 7.9 per cent. In the summer months it moves up to some 80.1 per cent vegetable matter which would be the time of the year when bear would be attacking sheep or other animals. The fall analysis slows this down a trifle and gives the vegetable matter some 54 per cent. All these things lead us to believe that the bear is actually not a meat animal.

Many farmers lose sheep each year and claim a damage of bears and being a little bit familiar with this type of thing, my business being insurance and we underwrite many cattle policies and many livestock policies and can be very

frank and sincere in stating that in my 25 years of underwriting practice we have paid many claims on sheep, cows and horses and only in one instance have we ever paid a claim so far as bear damage is concerned on sheep.

A recent survey made by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Game on black bear, published two years ago, in this particular case accounted for 32 investigations, 32 sheep cases involved from one to twenty-three sheep and totaled seventy-seven animals reported as killed by bear. Investigations prior to receipt of the claims by the Agricultural Department indicated that for at least twenty of these sheep damage was so old no sound conclusion could be drawn. Of the remainder, 33 were conclusively bear killers, one a natural death and twenty-three sheep and one goat appeared to represent a fraudulent investigation by local authorities. It is quite easy for the average person who is familiar with bear activities to know just how they kill their victims. It is generally by a blow on the forehead or a bite in the neck vertebra and the animal generally takes the carcass away and consumes it at its leisure.

The state in the last eight years has paid some ninety eight thousand dollars in bear bounties and some eighty six thousand dollars in bear claims.

Now this bill, of course would not prevent claims from being paid; we are in favor of the claims being paid. We were just given the bounties paid on bear.

Let us consider for just a moment if you will, \$98,000 over a six year period, and let's just project that amount. Say at a 5 per cent rate of interest. In fourteen years it would amount to roughly \$200,000. And let's project that for fourteen years; we arrive at \$400,000; and let's project that for fourteen years; we arrive at \$1,600,000; and let's project that for fourteen years; we arrive at \$3,200,000; and let's project that for fourteen years; we arrive at something over six and one half millions of dollars and that is what is paid by the people of the State of Maine on account of bear bounties. This is enough and more

too to build two new buildings like the one across from this original part of the statehouse, the new one that was completed last year. If we continue to pay the bear bounties, it could easily cost the State some ten to fifteen million dollars over the next thirty years. And it is the taxpayers' money.

I can remember distinctly some twenty-five to thirty years ago when we needed a new building across the way and certainly in twenty or forty, or fifty or seventy years we will still need additional buildings. At the hearing which was held some weeks ago we had many proponents and many opponents of the measure. We had one orchardist in here who had twenty or thirty acres and I asked him directly how much damage bear had done to his orchard and his answer was that somewhere between \$15 and \$20 would be the amount of damage done by bear over the last twenty year period. This would lead us to believe that bear do not do much damage to orchards.

We also had sheep owners who testified as opponents to this bounty bill. They said in their history they had never been bothered to any great extent on account of bear doing damage to their sheep. The Inland Fish and Game Department as you know will, if properly notified, send a group of trappers to any area where bear are disturbing livestock.

The bounty system has been terribly over exaggerated and is not the solution to keeping any predator down. Some of our most widely known bobcat hunters are definitely against bounties. Many of our summer tourists enjoy seeing these animals around camp dumps and town dumps. The only person that this bill, if passed, would benefit would be the trapper. It wouldn't benefit the farmer because he is not a trapper. The farmer still collects his claims. In one particular county one trapper caught some forty odd bear on which he collected a fifteen dollar bounty. He in turn sold the bear to fall hunters and the bear were sold for \$50 to \$75 each. Quite a nice bit of change at the expense of the taxpayer.

I received telegrams from practi-

cally all of the Fish and Game Clubs throughout the state with the exception of two or three and they are definitely all opposed to bear bounties.

I receive wires day in and day out and I have my desk half full of them but I will not bother to read them. I will admit the bear do occasionally break into camps and do damage but so do individuals and our wardens say that probably individuals or man does much more damage than bear.

The opponents will probably bring up that they destroy the blueberry crop. Well gulls probably destroy a lot more blueberry crops than bears, and so do deer. The other night prior to our hearing, I had a telephone call in the wee hours of the night. And they said, "Carpenter what are you going to do about the bear bounty?" I said, "I don't know, we haven't had a hearing on it yet." And he said, "Well I just got word from one of the paper companies that the bear are tearing the forests down." This disturbed me a little bit because owning a few shares in one of the paper companies I began to wonder whether or not they would continue to pay dividends but I dismiss this as a ridiculous remark.

Hunters are opposed to the way and method of some of the trappers who are catching bear. In other words, bear traps—I don't know how many of you are familiar with them, but many of you are—cannot be set without a claim. Once a dog becomes entangled in a bear trap unless you are right there to save him, he is gone; likewise a child or person. Much more restriction should be put on the hut where bear traps are set.

If this bill is killed it will save for many years millions and millions of dollars. We will still pay our bear claims. Do not be misled because we want the bounty system defeated. We do want the justifiable claims paid. Believe me as I stand here today I have seen many unjustifiable claims paid on sheep that bear never did. I will not move for the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. PARKER of Somerset: Mr. President and members of the Sen-

ate, some of you may possibly have heard I proposed to speak against this bill. Not dealing in that type of commodity known as millions of dollars which has been referred to by my good friend, the Senator from Somerset, Senator Carpenter, and not remembering something I have heard in some of my younger days about if you take a million dollars in dollar bills and place them end to end they will reach from here to Chicago, or was it San Francisco, but I am wondering how far ten million dollars would reach. It is way beyond my comprehension and I can't for the life of me correlate the thinking of ten million dollars project over fourteen years plus fourteen years plus fourteen and fourteen and fourteen, what that has to do with three or four of our counties in the northern and eastern part of the state that are having bear damage to such an extent that they believe the only way of controlling it is by bear bounty.

I didn't intend to make as many remarks as I have made because what I have in mind, I have additional information that I expect to get this afternoon or evening and for that reason I would like to have the bill tabled and I promise the Senator I will take the bill off tomorrow.

The motion prevailed and the bill was laid upon the table pending motion by Senator Carpenter of Somerset to indefinitely postpone; specially assigned for tomorrow.

On motion by Mr. Hillman of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Reports from the Committee on Labor: Majority report ought to pass; Minority report, ought not to pass; on bill, "An Act Relating to Minimum Wages." (S. P. 583) (L. D. 1583) tabled by that Senator on May 16 pending consideration of the reports.

Mr. HILLMAN of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate as a member of the Committee who signed the ought not to pass report, I would like to briefly give you my reasons. As you all know, we had two bills, L. D. 1247 and L. D. 341. After the hearing no agreement could be reached among the members of the committee in regard to these two bills. Therefore one mem-

ber of the committee made an attempt to rewrite the minimum wage law. And I will say that he did an excellent job of it. It was a hurried piece of work. There is no question in the short time he had to try to include all phases of our economy in one piece of work, that he was bound to overlook certain segments. Here in the State of Maine, we are a vacation state and yet if we pass legislation like this it will do nothing but hurt our hotels and restaurants and other phases of our economy.

Sure, you say we can pass the extra cost of doing business if this law were passed, along to the consumer, but just how much of this will the traffic stand here in Maine, and if some businesses have to close down, and many small business will do just that, who is going to absorb the layed off help? What about the town druggist and the small merchant and the elderly and the handicapped. Maine ranks fifth in the nation in its percentage of population in the age bracket of 65 years and over. It says in the bill that they can be taken care of by making application to the Department of Labor, but what employer is going to bother to go through such a procedure.

If a minimum wage law is going to be enacted in this state, consideration should be given to all segments of our economy and lesser minimums should be set for these workers mentioned previously. You can't consider all of these factors in a piece of hurried legislation such as this bill is.

Maine is not going to suffer by waiting a while to see how far the federal law will be broadened covering businesses in Maine not now covered by the Federal minimum wage law or until such time as a bill can be written by interested parties which will take into consideration all factors of our economy.

I would like to read to you, to quote from Commissioner of Labor Mitchell's speech when he referred to the broadening federal law.

"This administration does not propose to extend this act to the millions of small businesses. To do this would place a burden on them and might seriously curtail the profits

of many employees." That is what our Commissioner of Labor at the federal level said.

There is no demonstrated need for this bill here in the State of Maine and little if anything would be accomplished by it and it seems to me the bill would harm more people than it would help. I would like to make the motion to indefinitely postpone this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I rise in defense of the Labor Committee and position of the majority ought to pass on this particular bill. I would take some exception to my good friend, Senator Hillman of Penobscot, when he says that this was a hurried piece of legislation. I don't know just how much time you think a bill has to be considered before it forms itself from a hurried piece of legislation into an old and well considered piece of legislation but this bill was given very careful consideration by the members of the committee for several weeks and it was also discussed with the Governor and other interested parties, and it was gone over very thoroughly before it was finally accepted by the committee and reported out, as you now see it, L. D. 1583.

I am sure all of you know the principle behind a minimum wage. Very simply stated it is to guarantee that no citizen of the State of Maine would work for less than a living wage. Perhaps some of the arguments and discussions arise over what is a living wage but the committee has seen fit to say that a minimum of 75 cents an hour, which would add up to something like \$30 a week for a 40 hour week is a minimum below which none of our citizens should go. Nationally our U. S. Senate and Congress have seen fit to pass a minimum wage which covers a great many of our people and covers a lot of Maine citizens who are working in businesses concerned with interstate commerce. Therefore we have set up now a rather difficult situation of part of our citizens being covered and part of them not being covered. Several states have seen fit to enact minimum wage laws and that is one of the reasons why it has now come

to Maine. This is not a new measure but one which has been before several legislatures in the past.

There is need for the bill although some may argue that there is no need, but the committee heard from many people who were working in the State of Maine for what they considered starvation, or below living wages. It seemed obvious to a majority of the committee that a bill such as this was needed. That it was necessary for us to step forward and protect some of our citizens from being exploited.

Now the bill is a compromise bill of two other bills that were first submitted. And at the hearing that the Labor Committee held, we had several opponents appear who made great issues of a couple of things in both of the bills which have been taken out by this bill. In the first case there was a wage board to be appointed which would sit in judgment, would have tremendous powers. That has been dropped. There was also a great deal of opposition to the records that must be kept and this has been simplified a great deal. As you know, one bill called for a dollar minimum and the other called for .75. This bill came out as a compromise by dropping the Wage Board, by dropping the records needed and by compromising on 75 cents an hour. The bill is simple to administer. It merely calls for the employer to post on his bulletin board a notice of a 75 cent an hour minimum with the exemptions and the rules.

The employee if he feels he is not receiving his just wages or at least a 75 cent minimum can appeal to the Department of Labor and the Commissioner will look into the situation; and if she finds that it is true that they are receiving less than 75 cents total, then she can urge the employer to comply. If he doesn't then he is subject to the courts.

The exemptions have been very carefully studied and worked out with the hope that we would not seriously injure any business in the State of Maine, and at the same time provide a law which would in effect cover the workers who need coverage, and I might point out very briefly the exemptions we

have. Any person or individual employed in agriculture. Any individual employed in domestic service in or about a private home. Any individual employed as an outside salesman on commission basis. Any individual engaged in the activities of a public supported, non-profit organization or a program controlled by an educational non-profit organization. Any individual who is regularly enrolled in an educational institution or on vacation therefrom. Any part time worker working no more than fifteen hours per week for any one employer. Any individual engaged in commercial fishing or any individual employed as a switchboard operator in a telephone exchange that has less than 751 stations.

Most of these exemptions are contained in the federal law. A couple of them were put in to protect the industries that Senator Hillman of Penobscot spoke about. Our vacation business, hotels and restaurants have long said that they are a haven for college students and I expect perhaps that without that kind of industry many of our students would not be able to attend the college of their choice and so we have purposely excluded or exempted those who are enrolled in or on vacation from an educational institution.

At the same time we have given exemptions to those who are on part time work and we have set up provisions so that equal training apprentices in any business may serve at less than 75 cents during their apprentice period and any person who is handicapped is able to have an exemption under this.

Now I would like to just say again that this is a compromise bill. It was a serious attempt by the committee to come up with a bill that would be acceptable and would place on the books a bill which would take care of a situation not only in Maine but all over the nation where workers are required to work at what is considered less than a living wage. At the same time might I say that this recommendation for a minimum wage is contained in both platforms of both major parties and although I am not too familiar with the platform

of one of them, I am with the other, and I know the Republican platform recognizes the fundamental justice inherent in the principle of a minimum wage and endorses it without reservation. I think that speaks for itself.

Mr. ST. PIERRE of Androscoggin: Mr. President, when the vote is taken, I ask that it be taken by a roll call.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Hillman, that the bill be indefinitely postponed; and the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator St. Pierre has asked for a roll call. To order a roll call requires the affirmative vote of one-fifth the members present.

A division of the Senate was had.

Obviously more than one-fifth having risen, the roll call was ordered.

The Secretary called the roll.

YEA: Senators: Bailey of Sagadahoc, Briggs of Aroostook, Brown of Washington, Butler of Franklin, Carpenter of Somerset, Cole of Waldo, Davis of Cumberland, Dow of Lincoln, Ferguson of Oxford, Hillman of Penobscot, Low of Knox, Parker of Piscataquis, Pike of Oxford, Reed of Aroostook, Rogerson of Aroostook, Silsby of Hancock, Sinclair of Somerset, Willey of Hancock, Wyman of Washington:—19.

NAY: Senators; Boucher of Androscoggin, Charles of Cumberland, Curtis of Cumberland, Dunn of Kennebec, Farley of York, Fournier of York, Hall of York, Hurley of Kennebec, Lessard of Androscoggin, Lord of Cumberland, Martin of Kennebec, St. Pierre of Androscoggin and Woodcock of Penobscot—13.

Nineteen having voted in the affirmative and thirteen opposed, the motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin

Recessed for five minutes.

After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

On motion by Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Reports from the Committee Appropriations and Financial Affairs on ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment A, on bill, "An Act Increasing Compensation of Clerks of the Law Court." (S. P. 290) (L. D. 789) tabled by that Senator on May 16 pending consideration of the report; and on motion by the same Senator, Committee Amendment A was read and adopted and under suspension of the rules the bill was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the committee on Liquor Control: ought not to pass on bill, "An Act Relating to Local Option for Sale of Liquor by Certain Part Time Hotels." (H. P. 665) (L. D. 946) tabled by that Senator on May 17 pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act Relating to Gifts of Securities and Money to Minors." (H. P. 9) (L. D. 8) tabled by that Senator on May 17 pending motion by Senator Briggs of Aroostook to substitute the bill for the report; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Briggs.

Mr. BRIGGS of Aroostook: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have conferred with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I have an amendment to offer to this document and at least two of the members of the Judiciary Committee that I discussed it with are in favor of my being able to submit this amendment.

Thereupon the bill was substituted for the ought not to pass report and read once; Senate Amendment A was read and adopted and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr.

President, I would ask if L. D. 1278 is in the possession of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that bill, "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees, L. D. 1278, is in the possession of the Senate having been held at the request of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Butler.

On motion by Mr. Butler of Franklin, the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby it accepted the ought not to pass report of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Franklin: Mr. President and members of the Senate, as we look at this bill, I feel that we should take into consideration that our state employees are driving a small number of miles in comparison, that the cost of driving has increased, that even though we have had figures submitted to us to certain costs, yet those costs can be duplicated by other figures, the American Legal Association has produced figures on the cost of driving light cars and heavy cars even within the State of Maine, which figures are higher than that of the bill and in view of that and the fine service that we are getting from our state employees I feel that we should recognize these increased costs and give them what the bill calls for and therefore I move that the bill be substituted for the ought not to pass report.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Somerset: Mr. President, I rise in defense of the committee on this bill again. I recognize that there is a great deal of pressure for the passage of this bill. I would point out again that there is a price tag of \$186,000 on this particular bill and I would also point out that I recognize that at the extreme ends, the upper and lower end of the program in all probability there may be some cases where it might create a hardship. The committee discussed this very thoroughly and in view of information submitted to us by companies which have automobiles for their employees that the cost was not as high or any higher than what the state is now paying. I recognize that certain segments of the employee group who have are very anxious to have this particular bill passed and there are other segments of the group which have no interest in this.

I would like to point out also that within the last few days we discussed another bill relative to the fortnightly payment of salaries of state officers and employees. A certain segment of the employees opposed that particular bill. There was an opportunity for the state to save some money. At the public hearing on that bill, certain segments of the state employees association appeared and opposed the bill because it would work a hardship on certain individuals.

I realize we are not talking about that particular bill at this time but I point out that the pressure is being put on for this particular bill involving very much the same group or segment of state employees as were anxious for the passage of this mileage bill. I really feel that this is not necessary for the overall complete group of employees traveling for the state. I hope that the motion of the Senator from Franklin, Senator Butler does not prevail.

Mr. MARTIN of Kennebec: Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Somerset, Senator Sinclair quoted many figures in regard to the usage and cost and Senator Butler today, the Senator from Franklin County has spoken of the American Legal Association. I have before me the figures that they give, and on a ten thousand annual mileage on a low priced car the cost for operation is 10.36. On a larger car it is .13 for the same amount of mileage. I give you these figures to show that this is an unbiased association and they have given figures which I think we can rely upon. I maintain it is unfair for the state to ask many an employee to travel in his car at his own expense while in the employment of the state and required by the state to use his car. I hope that the motion of Senator Butler of Franklin prevails.

Thereupon, a viva voce vote of the Senate was had, and the bill substituted for the report, given its first reading and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Martin of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table House Reports from the Committee on Public Utilities: Majority report, ought to pass with Committee Amendment A; Minor-

ity report, ought not to pass on bill, "An Act Relating to Facilities Furnished by Public Utilities for Rate Filing Purposes," (H. P. 186) (L. D. 249) tabled by that Senator on May 10 pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Majority ought to pass report was accepted and House Amendment A was read and indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Senate Amendment A was read and adopted and on motion by Mr. Lessard of Androscoggin, Senate Amendment A was ordered printed in document form, and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, "An Act to Correct Inconsistencies in Maine State Retirement System Law." (S. P. 87) (L. D. 197) tabled by that Senator on May 14 pending enactment; and on further motion by the same Senator the bill was passed to be enacted.

Mr. Dow of Lincoln was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate.

Mr. DOW of Lincoln: Mr. President and members of the Senate, yesterday we saw a good bill go the way of many good bills for lack of funds. I am speaking of the bill for an appropriation to finance the operation of an educational T.V. station which was sent out as ought not to pass. I realize that the so-called Jacobs bill is a giant step for Maine to take in the progress of education and know that there are limits to the amount of services our people here in this state can enjoy. For this reason I reluctantly accepted the unanimous report of the appropriations committee. However, for those of you who may be faced with a similar request at the next session, I would like to point out, briefly, why I feel that Educational Television should be given close attention in the near future.

I believe that the historical decision of the F.C.C. in 1952 reserving a part of the broadcasting spectrum for educational television opened up a new frontier in educa-

tion. Today, 259 T.V. channels across the nation, reserved for education constitute one of our most valuable public resources, and the degree of their development in little more than four years represents one of the greatest achievements in the history of education.

As sponsor of this year's bill, and as chairman of the state committee, appointed by the Governor, I should like to quote a few of our findings from our report which was made to the Governor on Dec. 14, 1956.

1. Thirty such stations are now on the air covering areas with a total population of about fifty million. Four more stations are in actual construction.

2. More than thirty states, of which Maine is one, have appointed committees or study groups to secure information and make recommendations regarding the use of educational T.V.

3. Documentary evidence shows that during the past four years, more than fifty million dollars has been spent by public and private interests to finance studies and to help build stations throughout the country. Of this amount about 11 million has come from legislative appropriations in the various states; 7 million has been contributed by business, religious and charitable groups; 6 million have been offered by commercial broadcasters in cash and equipment; and 25 million have been provided by foundations.

The demonstrated values of educational television are too numerous to mention. All I can say is that its possibilities are tremendous.

Education in Maine reflects the physical characteristics and the economic and social conditions that exist. Because much of our population is distributed in widely separated areas, we have many small schools which handicap the children in many ways. The people in Maine are aware of these problems and have attempted within their means to alleviate them. Many of these problems could be helped immeasurably by educational television, to a far greater degree than is possible on commercial channels.

Within the past year 7000 Maine citizens have indicated an active interest by joining and donating to a non-profit organization known as

Educational Television Association, Inc., which is dedicated to the purpose of activating channel 12 at the University of Maine, by raising funds to build the station. Our committee felt justified in recommending that the legislature appropriate operational funds in view of the fact that the constructional costs of the station would come from private sources.

It is my sincere hope that the Federal Communications Commission will recognize that we here in Maine are making an honest effort to establish a station for educational television, and that we will not lose our allotted channel by reason of default, so that in a few years our children and adults will be able to enjoy this phase of educational advancement instead of again finding ourselves way behind the rest of the country in this important step in the field of learning.

Mr. COLE of Waldo: Mr. President, may I inquire if H. P. 435, L. D. 611, is in the possession of the Senate, it being "Resolve to provide for increase in State Pension for Leeman Grant of Columbia Falls?"

The PRESIDENT: The Chair will state that L. D. 611 is in the possession of the Senate, having been held at the request of the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole.

Mr. COLE: Mr. President, having voted in the affirmative, I now move that we reconsider our action of yesterday whereby we passed this bill to be engrossed.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, moves that the Senate reconsider its action of yesterday whereby the resolve was passed to be engrossed. Is this the pleasure of the Senate?

The motion for reconsideration prevailed.

Mr. COLE: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I dislike very much to rise in opposition to this resolve, however, I have been sitting here all winter pretty much glued to my chair when we accepted the philosophy as presented to us by the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis, in L. D. 1413. I want to publicly commend the good Senator for his statements, which I endorse fully. It seems very

unfair to me that many of us having resolves that went down the drain just because we were sincere and believed in the statements of the good Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis, that we now sit here and pass resolves in favor of a few others. I believe very strongly in the principles enumerated by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Davis, and I feel very strongly that it is very unfair, as I said before, for us to take defeat, go back home and tell our constituents, "No, we accepted this principle, this philosophy, which is absolutely sound, and yet others will take home their little pension for their constituents.

Mr. President, I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Cumberland: Mr. President and members of the Senate: From the evidence that was presented to us in connection with this resolve there is considerable doubt in my mind whether there is any actual need in this case. As I pointed out to you yesterday, if there is need he is eligible for relief under one of our four categories, in this case Old Age Assistance. I think we are being extremely unfair to those some fifty or sixty similar resolves which we have killed, some of them presented by members of this body, if we go along and pass this one. I hope you will be consistent and support the motion of the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole.

Mrs. LORD of Cumberland: Mr. President, I would just like to make a few statements about this bill. It wasn't my bill in the first place, and I can say that in the four terms I have served in the legislature I have never introduced a resolve for aid to anybody. I do think this is a worthy cause, the committee report was a divided report, and the Senate voted to pass this resolve and I hope they will continue to vote that way.

Mr. FARLEY of York: Mr. President and members of the Senate: I am going to support the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole. I have sat here and listened to a lot of evidence on bills and claims and this and that. I feel quite a little disturbed about the voting yesterday for the resolve, but I see now it has

been given passage. It does not seem right to me to be sitting here and voting on questions of interest to the State of Maine in trying to save some money if we do not follow our committees. I too have been pressured but I have passed a lot of pressure through the window. I will stand on the principles I think are right. Although some members have taken a different action, I am going to go a long with the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Waldo, Senator Cole, that the resolve be indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the resolve was tabled pending the motion of Mr. Cole of Waldo that it be indefinitely postponed.

On motion by Mr. Silsby of Hancock, the Senate voted to take from the table House report from the Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game: ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act Relating to Closed Season on Deer in Towns of Deer Isle and Stonington." (H. P. 160) (L. D. 207) tabled by that Senator earlier in today's session pending consideration of the report.

Mr. SILSBY of Hancock: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I am somewhat confused this morning and if it had not been for my good friend the Senator from Hancock, Senator Willey, I am afraid I might have done my good county of Hancock substantial damage. This bill is a measure which closed the towns of Deer Isle and Stonington to deer hunting and prior to the last session of the legislature, the town of Deer Isle and the town of Stonington had been closed for quite a number of years and some thought they wanted to open the isle up and a bill was presented and the island was open and in the hunting season of last year there was a great deal of confusion and chaos because of the town's sentiment because there were some areas where there were a lot of summer people who had cottages and the hunters did shoot some windows out of the cottages and trespass actions arose.

Now I don't want to take any issue with the Inland Fish and Game

Department or with the committee but this is an area in the State of Maine which should be a game management area because some of the island should be closed and some of it should be open and therefore it being so late in the session of the legislature we could not now prepare a resolve for a game management area and I hope you will go along with me for I am about to move to substitute the bill for the report and that would close the island in the next hunting season and I hope when the next session of the legislature convenes they will iron this trouble out and therefore, Mr. President I move that the bill be substituted for the report.

The motion prevailed, the bill was substituted for the report and under suspension of the rules was given its two several readings and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Charles of Cumberland, the Senate voted to take from the table House reports from the Committee on Business Legislation: Report A, Ought to pass in New Draft; Report B, Ought not to pass, on bill, "An Act to Eliminate Discrimination Between Purchasers." (H. P. 932) (L. D. 1325) tabled by that Senator on May 10 pending consideration of the reports; and on further motion by the same Senator, Report A, Ought to pass in New Draft was accepted and the bill read once.

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

Which amendment was read and adopted and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Cole of Waldo, the Senate voted to take from the table Conference Committee Report on "Joint Resolution Memorializing Congress to Enact Legislation Concerning Unjustified Price Increases of Crude Oil and Refined Petroleum Products." (S. P. 378) (L. D. 1001) tabled by that Senator on May 20 pending consideration of the report; and that Senator yielded to the Senator from Piscataquis, Senator Parker.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the Conference Committee report was accepted.

On motion by Mr. Parker of Piscataquis, the Senate voted to take from the table Senate Report from the Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs: Ought not to pass, on "Resolve Providing for a Vocational Technical Institute in Eastern Maine." (S. P. 463) (L. D. 1344) tabled by that Senator on May 16 pending consideration of the report.

Mr. PARKER of Piscataquis: Mr. President and members of the Senate, this resolve was to provide funds for a vocational technical institute in the eastern part of the state. I am sure you are all familiar with the fact that there were two other resolves presented at the session, one for Androscoggin county and the other for Aroostook County. The Appropriations Committee in their wisdom decided in order to satisfy no one, that all three resolves should come out Ought not to pass. Probably had I been a member of that committee I would have done the same thing.

I think the solution to this problem, and it is a problem, we do need additional facilities for our boys who, because they do not want to go to college or do not have the opportunity to go to college should be able to get training to fit them for a profession and I believe the solution is that we ask the research committee to make a study of this problem and present it to the next legislature as to cost, location and other things that may develop and as I have presented a resolve to that effect within the last few days, I move that this bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion prevailed and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Wyman of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table House Report from the Committee on Towns and Counties: Ought not to pass, on recommended bill, "An Act to Create a

Board of Harbor Commissioners for Penobscot Bay and River.” (H. P. 1032) (L. D. 1464) tabled by that Senator on May 16 pending consideration of the report; and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill

was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Low of Knox

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.