

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

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



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

**LEGISLATIVE RECORD**

OF THE

***One Hundred and Eleventh  
Legislature***

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

**Volume I**

**FIRST REGULAR SESSION**

**December 1, 1982 to May 13, 1983**

Senator from Oxford, Senator Erwin.

Senator ERWIN: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think that this Body is extremely fortunate to have such a dedicated individual as Senator Wood. Some of you may be aware of what he has gone through in these many weeks that he has been working on this Bill. He has discussed the Bill with every group that really wanted to discuss it with him, despite what the rumors maybe. He has talked over the phone with everyone who wanted to discuss the Bill with him.

This Bill does not actually change the laws under which the Humane Society will operate. What it changes is it creates a Board that will replace a Division in the Department of Agriculture. It will still be operating under the Department of Agriculture.

Any appointment to this Board will be screened by the Committee on Agriculture, that nomination then if successful would come to the Senate for your approval.

We have deliberately put three members on the Board, first term for one year, giving plenty of opportunity if there is a problem to correct it.

In our last work session we were fortunate in having a former Commissioner of Agriculture present. He appeared to indicate that he was not for this Bill when it was first presented, however he was heartedly for it now. One of the statements that he made was the Board of Pesticides went through the same problems that we are going through now. Many of the people who detested the proposed bill then on pesticides now are very glad that they have that Board. The former commissioner predicted that this would be the feeling a year from now about this Bill.

He said that for the first time people that have been fighting each other like some of the animals that they choose to protect will now be forced to be in the same room to have discourse to discuss things, the problems and perhaps for one of the first times in the history of this State the humane societies and other groups will be working together. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Chair will order a Division.

Will all those Senators in favor of the motion by the Senator from York, Senator Hichens to Indefinitely Postpone L. D. 1530, please rise in their places to be counted.

Will all those Senators opposed, please rise in their places to be counted.

4 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 25 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to Indefinitely Postpone, Failed.

Which was Passed to be Enacted, and having been signed by the President was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

#### Emergency

An Act to Override the Federal Preemption of State Authority to Regulate Alternative Mortgage Transactions (H. P. 790) (L. D. 1082)

This being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 32 members of the Senate, with No Senators having voted in the negative, was Passed to be Enacted, and having been signed by the President, was by the Secretary presented to the Governor for his approval.

#### Orders of the Day

On motion by Senator Pray of Penobscot, the Senate voted to take from the Table:

BILL, "An Act to Require the Wearing of Protective Headgear by All Motorcycle, Motor Driven Cycle and Moped Riders." (H. P. 836) (L. D. 1072) Tabled earlier in today's session, on motion by Senator Pray of Penobscot pending the motion by Senator Minkowsky of Androscoggin to Recede. (A Roll Call having been Ordered)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the

Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky.

Senator MINKOWSKY: Mr. President, and Members of the Senate, part of the rational that I would like to put on the Record this morning, as to why I have moved and why I have been an advocate, of, for the continued repeal of the Helmet Law is partly because of what is contained in this study, that I hold in my hand, entitled, "The Wisconsin Motor Cycle Helmet Law: A Before and After Study of Helmet Law Repeal."

One of the things that came out of this study and I would like to read it for your edification this morning, this was undertaken by the Department of Transportation in the State of Wisconsin, and it says, "It is our conclusion that the study contains ample evidence that helmets save lives and prevent head injuries. We hope that cyclists will study the data and subsequently wear helmets. We do not, however, see in the study a mandate for reinstatement of the mandatory helmet law."

Why? Since the study shows that helmeted riders suffer head injuries in one out of four accidents, and that is in the State of Wisconsin, it is clear that the motorcycle safety problem can not be solved by any single measure. By any single measure. Instead an effective motor cycle safety program must concentrate on preventing the accident from happening in the first place.

Now how did the State of Wisconsin approach this? The Department of Transportation came up with some recommendations, which we in the State of Maine through the United Bikers of Maine have been attempting to do since the repeal of the helmet law in 1977. Their recommendations, and I'll just put a few of these into the Record. Number one, continuing the equal rights,—interesting term isn't it?—campaign through the media and other means to education the other drivers about cycling rights.

The second recommendation, continue emphasis on the other driver actively looking for cyclists in traffic, in addition to others looking for larger vehicles. I call that defensive driving.

Number three, encourage rider training programs so that all beginning cyclists have access to an accredited training program. We have been attempting to do this for a long time. Attempts have been made through the Maine Highway Safety Committee, through the Department of Transportation, through the Secretary of State's Office, but again a lot of it revolves around the fact that we have a very, very exceedingly short driving season in Maine.

Number four, provide advance rider training programs. We have attempted to do that, also.

Number five, that the Department of Transportation make grants to responsible groups, public and private to augment and help fund programs to accomplish the above recommendations.

The next recommendation that the Department of Transportation continue to encourage voluntary use of helmets and other safety gear. I'll reemphasize that point, that the Department continue to encourage voluntary use of helmets and other safety gear, and support legislation to improve motorcyclists visibility such as modulating headlights.

The final recommendation that the Department of Transportation in the State of Wisconsin not support any attempt to reinstate a mandatory helmet law that may detract from the comprehensive motor cycle safety program.

All that we are asking for is an opportunity to continue trying to indoctrinate the number of cyclists in the State of Maine with a mandatory educational program. This is the solution to the problem, not mandating, regulating, and over-regulating our citizens of the State of Maine.

Bear in mind of the sixty-eight thousand cyclists in Maine they are not all young people,

many of them are senior citizens. It was actually interesting the senior citizens who have contacted me who were outraged at the reinstatement of the helmet law.

I think that it is really of significant value, and it was interesting using that term "equal rights", I used "freedom of choice" last time, now I have a new phrase that we can actually capitalize on this morning.

I would hope that the Senate would accept the motion that I made earlier to Recede from Passage to be Engrossed, when I requested a Roll Call vote, and then at that particular point we can make another decision.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Clark.

Senator CLARK: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, Men and Women of the Senate, I have consistently voted against the reinstatement of the mandatory helmet law for the motorcyclists and moped riders across our State thus far in this Session, and that is exactly where my sentiments are this morning. However I have great concern about the pending motion to Recede because there was in this Body this morning a young girl named Samantha Smith, who promoted communication, communication between a girl and a major world leader, and communication between two major countries. It would seem that if we supported the pending motion that we would indeed be denying an opportunity for representative of both sides of this issue to meet and consult in a Committee of Conference.

I believe in "freedom of choice" and I believe in "equal rights" I, also, subscribe to usually the results of honest and sincere communication. It is in that spirit that I am going to be voting against the motion to Recede and hope that the Members of this Body will then Join in a Committee of Conference with the other Body. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator McBreaarty.

Senator MCBREARTY: Mr. President and Honorable Members of the Senate, I am one of those senior citizens that still ride the motor cycle when I have time, you people down here don't give me much time any more. I think that we are being very inconsistent when we require senior citizens to wear a helmet to ride a motorcycle and let young kids, five-years-old, if they wish, go out on these heavily trafficked streets with bicycles with no education, no restrictions whatever.

Now, I know of many people who have brought moped's in the last few years. They enjoy them, they ride around town a little bit. Now some day that it is ninety degrees in the shade their not going to enjoy that trip very much if they have to put one of these heavy helmets on. So I would hope that which ever move we make that we finally eliminate, or kill this Bill. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Diamond.

Senator DIAMOND: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate, I will be very brief, we have kind of missed the issue this morning. We have heard about senior citizens, and five-year-olds and middle age, and all the folks that ride on bikes and I appreciate that, in fact, I was a little surprised to get the senior citizens involved in this issue.

The issue before us is do we allow two groups on either side of this issue to set down and talk about it? That is the issue, and that is the only issue that we have left.

I am not naive enough to think that anything of gigantic value is going to come out of it in terms of turning a lot of people around. I do think though that communication is important and that is the issue before us now, and I hope that we can get on with that vote. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Danton.

Senator DANTON: Mr. President, and Mem-

bers of the Senate, the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky went on and told us about these reports from Wisconsin, for the many years that he has served in the Maine Senate, why hasn't he taken the leadership if he is so concerned about equal rights and safety and everything else that he mentioned in his speech? But he has done nothing, and he knows that he has done nothing. He's just doing today what is popular, not responsible.

What are we asking for? We are asking for a Committee of Conference to get both sides together like the good Senator from Cumberland just stated. Not kill the Bill, do away with it, try to mislead people that no one is getting killed on our highways. Those are out and out lies if anyone thinks that. I would be surprised if anyone in this Senate Chamber thought that anyone riding a motorcycle without a helmet was a safe as could be. Let's not be like an ostrich and bury our heads into the sand.

Now when we talk about high rates of speed you can wear twenty-five helmets it doesn't make any difference, because at that point you being a projectile and whatever you hit you've had it.

I think that the main concern about helmets, the main concern about helmets, is at low speeds, and as far as mopeds are concerned maybe something can be worked out in the Committee of Conference, but at least give both sides that opportunity. Not just kill the Bill and say that there is nothing wrong just to go home and be popular with whatever person rides a motorcycle and get a vote to get re-elected.

You know we got elected to the Maine Senate to come here and try to do what we feel is responsible, not just popular and the good Senator can take and give us all the citations, he wants from a report in Wisconsin. What has Maine done for motorcycles and motor cycle riders?

I want them all to ride their motorcycles. I want them all to enjoy riding their motorcycles. I want them all to be safe with then ride their motorcycles.

I gave you the figures just a week or so ago, how motorcycle riding has increased in the last ten years how accidents have gone from four hundred to almost twelve hundred in the last ten years. Is there any truth to that? There must be it came from Public Safety and they really haven't got a good statistical record keeping process going on over to the Department.

Why doesn't the good Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky think of a way to fund that Department, but all I know is that every time we ask for funds he votes against it, because that is the popular thing to do back home.

I just ask you the Members of the Senate there is nothing wrong with a Committee of Conference. Those of us that understand that process know that nothing really happens in one way or the other, there is a common ground, maybe. In most cases there is not. At least give it an opportunity to try to work.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Waldo, Senator Shute.

Senator SHUTE: Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I don't think any Committee of Conference would do much on this Bill. Now I have been here fourteen years and I have been on a few Committee of Conferences and I have seen quite a few, probably a hundred, and I doubt that I have ever seen one thing come out of one Committee of Conference yet, and I don't think that you would this year.

Now I think that we have done enough to protect the people this year, we have given them the Child Restraint Bills, and so the Children will be safe and the parents that don't have enough common sense to take care of their children will be taken care of.

If your going to have a helmet bill put in on

the children with the bicycles, don't put it on the adults. I think that the adults have enough common sense to ride safe, but I am not sure that the children do. So if you are going to do something for safety, do it with the children. We did it with the Child Restraint Seat thing, so let's do it with the helmet the children and not for the adults.

I think that we have another Bill in to require safety belts on everyone in an automobile. Now how far are we going this session, this year, to make people safe?

I've heard comments here this year about a gas tax, I think they were referring to, well I think that everyone here knows that last session of the Legislature a good many people voted for that gas tax but other ones didn't. So I think that if we're going to be up front about the whole thing let's kill this Bill and let the people have a little say about their own safety.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Carpenter.

Senator CARPENTER: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate last time that I spoke on this Bill I stood here and tried to convince you that we should not tell bike riders, adults, that they had to do something.

I stand here today and say that I think that we ought to offer or agree with the offer from the other Body that we ought to set and talk about this issue.

I have concerns about people who have just started riding motor cycles, and I think that that is one area that could be compromised on. I will not vote to Recede and then kill the Bill, this morning, I will be voting for a Committee of Conference, and I would ask some of the people who supported my position the last time to join in that effort.

I think that there is definitely some movement from all sides in this issue, and I think that there is something that can be worked out in this session something significant. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky.

Senator MINKOWSKY: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I have listened very attentively to the remarks made by my very dear friend the Senator from York, Senator Danton. I believe that he is a fine human being, and I don't think that he sincerely means what he has said, that I have attempted to mislead anybody in this Maine Senate.

My assessment of this Bill is that I have addressed it from a very ethical, hopefully a very honest, and constructive point of view. All I projected to the Senate was the statistics drafted by the Department of Transportation, Department of Public Safety of actually what has happened here in the State of Maine and the basic causes for those accidents.

In regards to the very very clear remarks made by that good Senator from Androscoggin, and Cumberland, Senator Clark. I have not stymied communication. I'm an advocate for communication, and we have been communicating ever since this Bill has been in this Legislature, time is precious, time is of essence and as others have brought out, the end result before the Committee Conference is going to fail. Everything has been discussed and has been said, everybody understands the issue very clearly.

I brought in the senior citizens, because they do represent a large segment of our riding population, not only on mopeds, I might say, but on regular motorcycles. Yet, we had no difficulty taking away that mandatory test when those people reach seventy-five years of age, as a regular bill and coming in with an Emergency Preamble after that to be sure that they were not, and some of these people who drive vehicles, drive motorcycles. If we certainly can go through that particular scenario and say to these people no longer will they be required

after age seventy-five to have examinations. Why should we compel the people who are professional riders who have the expertise, as I brought out previously, to wear helmets.

No one in the association, the United Bikers of Maine or anybody else who has been a rider for several numbers of years is opposed to wearing helmets. You'll find that most of these people here this morning do wear helmets. We do not want to be mandated. The statistics don't warrant it. That is what I brought out before.

In a free society in a State as large as Maine, people are fed up with regulation and over-regulation, intrusion into our lives, enough is enough, and we've got to that particular point. Whether it's the bill that is coming up later on relevant to mandating seatbelts or whether it's the bill we passed last week on the child restraint seats, we're going overboard. People in this State have enough common sense to do what they feel is right and proper, they don't have to be told by a Legislature.

I can assure you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I did not get involved in this Bill for popularity, or for political expediency in the next campaign those thoughts never entered my mind. I'm truly disappointed that my very dear, dear friend would allude that that was my intent and the objective I had in mind. I have been consistent over the years. From the time I served on the illustrious Transportation Committee when this bill was repealed, based upon facts, based upon studies not only in the State of Maine, but in other states.

I would hope that each and everyone of you this morning would look to how your constituents have reacted towards this. If you are not home, I'm sure when you do get home there will be a number of telephone calls, as we do get in many other bills, that will tell you how disenchanted the citizens of Maine are in being dictated to again for the short season that we actually have in the utilization of motorcycles or mopeds.

The responsible thing for anybody to do this morning as the other Branch did but flipped flopped on it, and I think that was a proper term I had used earlier. I don't want to find the Maine Senate doing the very same thing. I think we owe this courtesy to our constituency to say to the people of the State of Maine, you had enough trust and confidence to elect us, certainly we have trust and confidence in you to make your own personal decision whether you shall wear a helmet or you will not.

Again, freedom of choice is a right that should not be denied any citizen in the State of Maine.

#### (Off Record Remarks)

The PRESIDENT: Is the Senate ready for the question?

The pending question before the Senate is the motion by the Senator from Androscoggin, Senator Minkowsky that the Senate Recede.

A Yes vote will be in favor of the motion to Recede.

A No vote will be opposed.

The Doorkeepers will secure the Chamber.

The Secretary will call the Roll.

#### ROLL CALL

YEA—Dow, Emerson, Erwin, Hichens, Kany, McBreairty, Minkowsky, Redmond, Sewall, Shute, Teague, Twitchell, Usher, Violette,

NAY—Baldacci, Brown, Bustin, Carpenter, Charette, Clark, Collins, Danton, Diamond, Du-tremble, Gill, Hayes, Najarian, Pearson, Perkins, Pray, Trafton, Wood, The President—Gerard P. Conley

Senator Violette of Aroostook was granted permission to change his vote from Yea to Nay.

A Roll Call was had.

13 Senators having voted in the affirmative and 20 Senators in the negative, with No Senators being absent, the motion to Recede, Failed.

Is it now the pleasure of the Senate to Insist and Join in a Committee of Conference?

It is a vote.

Senator Pray of Penobscot was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate, Off the Record.

Senator Usher of Cumberland was granted unanimous consent to address the Senate, Off the Record.

There being no objections all items previously acted upon were sent forthwith.

On motion by Senator Carpenter of Aroostook, Recessed until 4 o'clock this afternoon.

#### Recess

#### After Recess

The Senate called to Order by the President.

Out of Order and Under Suspension of the Rules, the Senate voted to consider the following:

#### Order

#### Joint Order

On motion by Senator Najarian of Cumberland, the following Joint Order (S. P. 544)

Ordered, the House concurring, that "AN ACT to Promote the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas of Maine," S. P. 441, L. D. 1348 be recalled from the Governor's desk to the Senate.

Which was Read and Passed.

Sent down forthwith for concurrence.

#### Orders of the Day

The President laid before the Senate the first Tabled and specially assigned matter.

BILL, "An Act to Extend Consumers Freedom of Choice Regarding Insured Mental Health Services" (H. P. 743) (L. D. 955)

Tabled—May 6, 1983 by Senator PRAY of Penobscot.

Pending—Passage to be Engrossed.

(In House May 4, 1983 Passed to be Engrossed as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-190)

On motion by Senator Pray of Penobscot, Retabled for 1 Legislative Day.

The President laid before the Senate the second Tabled and specially assigned matter:

SENATE REPORT—from the Committee on Labor on BILL, "An Act to Prohibit Residency Requirements for Municipal Employees" (S. P. 61) (L. D. 167) Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-90).

Tabled—May 6, 1983 by Senator PRAY of Penobscot.

Pending—Acceptance of Committee Report.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins.

Senator COLLINS: Mr. President, this Bill that was established a prohibition against residency requirements is of particular concern to some of the municipalities in my own district.

If I were on a municipal body, I might very well accept the general outlines of this Bill as good municipal policy, however, the problems that I have at this level is that it means that we in Augusta will be telling all of our municipalities what they should do in terms of where their employees reside. I think that our municipalities are perfectly capable of deciding that for themselves, and therefore, I hope that we will not Accept the Ought to Pass Report and would request a Division.

The PRESIDENT: A Division has been requested.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Penobscot, Senator Pearson.

Senator PEARSON: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this is my Bill, and it is not any type or piece of radical Legislation. It says that a—it sets some guidelines

for people who are employed by a municipality. All it says is that if you are in an emergency situation working a job that might be an emergency nature, like a firefighter, or a person that works on the ambulance crew, or a person who is in the police department, the town may impose upon you a distance requirement, you have to live within so many miles, or within so many minutes response of the job that you have to perform.

It goes on to say that if you don't do those types of jobs, that you should not be required to live in the town.

The PRESIDENT: Will all those Senators in favor of Accepting the Ought to Pass Report of the Committee, please rise in their places to be counted.

Will all those Senators opposed, please rise in their places to be counted.

21 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and 6 Senators having voted in the negative, the motion to Accept the Ought to Pass as amended Report, Prevailed.

The Bill Read Once.

Committee Amendment "A" (S-90) was Read.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Dutremble.

Senator DUTREMBLE: Mr. President, I offer Senate Amendment "A" (S-107) and move its Adoption.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from York, Senator Dutremble offers Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" and moves its Adoption.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-107) to Committee Amendment "A" was Read.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Knox, Senator Collins.

Senator COLLINS: Mr. President, I'd like to pose a question through the Chair, as I understand it this Amendment would further refine this invasion into municipal powers by making local collective bargaining contracts the standard and prohibiting any ordinances that relate to employee residence.

It seems to me, again, that we're moving from government at the State level and something that could well be local, to government by collective bargaining agreement. I wonder if the good Senator might comment on that.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Knox, Senator Collins has posed a question through the Chair to any Member of the Committee who may wish to respond if they so desire.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from York, Senator Dutremble.

Senator DUTREMBLE: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, this Amendment clarifies the original Committee Amendment where we had on one portion of the Bill stated that a municipality may not enact ordinances concerning residency requirements then further on in the Bill we said that they could either enact ordinances, or through collective bargaining enact ordinances that would set the minimum requirements that are specified by the Committee Amendment.

The problems we had with that, was, of course, the municipality could choose either one they wanted to and be covered by the law, as it was written. This Amendment is drafted so that if a municipality does not have collective bargaining, then it could still enact ordinances stated those requirements that are mentioned in the Amendment.

Senate Amendment "A" (S-107) was Adopted.

Committee Amendment "A" as amended by Senate Amendment "A" thereto was Adopted.

The Bill, as amended, Tomorrow Assigned for Second Reading.

The President laid before the Senate the third Tabled and specially assigned matter.

BILL, "An Act Concerning Public Easements for Access to Harvested Lands and Cemeteries" (S. P. 326) (L. D. 971)

Tabled—May 6, 1983 by Senator PRAY of Penobscot

Pending—Enactment

(In House May 5, 1983 Passed to be Enacted)

The PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes the Senator from Somerset, Senator Redmond.

Senator REDMOND: Members of the Senate, L. D. 971, "An Act Concerning Public Easements for Access to Harvested Lands and Cemeteries" the title of this Bill, under Title 23, Section 3022, now allows municipal officials to layout a public easement in certain cases.

A public easement is a right-of-way allowing the public to cross over another's land to gain access to land, or water not otherwise connected to a public way. This right-of-way must connect with a town way or a highway.

Under the present law, the only ones allowed to petition the municipality for a public easement are occupants of land or owners cultivating land. This Bill is intended to clarify the meaning of the word "cultivate" to conform it with present law. It adds only one new category of people who may petition the town for a public easement. Those wishing access to a cemetery. The present law allows those who cultivate land to petition a town and this term confuses some people who believe towns have the power to lay out an easement only if the person cultivates farm crops, such as, hay, or corn, or cabbage, or turnips.

However, under the law cultivate has a broader meaning than that. The dictionary, the definition means "to help plants grow by labor and care. To produce by culture." This includes all plants, including trees. Maine has a long history of cases where the Supreme Judicial Court expanded the word cultivate even further. Under Maine Law, cultivated land, is land under improvement of any type, not just tilling by farm machinery. One case even stated that "A Mill site upon which a mill is erected is cultivated or improved land." Therefore, the current word cultivate already includes the growing of trees. This fact is reflected in the word "silviculture," which means "the cultivation of woods or forest. The growing and tending of trees as a branch of forestry."

Therefore, the law in the books today already covers the cultivation and growing of trees and would allow such landowner to petition the municipality for a public easement.

The reason I introduce this Bill to add the words, or harvested lands is to clarify the present law and reduce confusion in peoples' minds. Many laymen do not realize that the law already includes woodlands in the definition of cultivated lands. The word harvested is a common term and will make it clear to municipalities and residence that this right exists under the law.

The part of the Bill allowing in petition for public access to a cemetery is a new provision. There are many people who had feelings of deep respect for their predecessor. This has a long world tradition. As you may know, one of the important teachings of Confucius was veneration of one's ancestors. This respect is also, shown by many people who observe Memorial Day here in Maine by beautifying cemetery lots. These traditions are receiving new interests now from cemetery associations restoring historical cemeteries; artists doing grave rubbings of old markers, and especially, from genealogists. This is one of the Nation's fastest growing hobbies. There are already many who travel to Maine to learn about their ancestors. These ancestors were the backbone of our Nation. With the State increasing its efforts to promote tourists and economic development, and with our fine State Library with its good genealogy collection, it's likely that more people seeking their roots will return to our towns. Perhaps buying a pair of L. L. Bean boots, or other local supplies, and hike up old roads searching for the ruins of their ancestors, lands and grave sites.

The municipalities should be free to encour-