

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

Eighty-Second Legislature

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1925

KENNEBEC JOURNAL COMPANY
AUGUSTA, MAINE

Mr. KITCHEN of Presque Isle: In justice to the members of the Committee who signed the report "ought not to pass." I move that this matter lie on the table pending the motion of the gentleman from Sangerville, Mr. Leland, that Report "A" "ought to pass" be accepted.

Mr. LELAND: I will ask that the gentleman assign a date certain.

The SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from Presque Isle (Mr. Kitchen) assign a date certain.

Mr. KITCHEN: I will assign Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman assigns next Wednesday as the date certain. Is it the pleasure of the House that the matter be so assigned?

Thereupon the motion of Mr. Kitchen of Presque Isle, to lay on the table, prevailed and the matter was especially assigned for next Wednesday.

First Reading of Printed Bills

H. P. No. 445: An Act prohibiting fishing in the tributaries to St. Croix Lake, in Townships 7 and 8, Range 4, Aroostook County.

H. P. No. 454: An Act to ratify and make valid the incorporation of Hammond Street Congregational Church in Bangor.

H. P. No. 486: An Act relating to fishing in Stony Brook, in Newry and in Hanover, in Oxford County.

H. P. No. 533: An Act to prohibit fishing in the tributaries of Lake Anasagunticook in Canton and Hartford in the county of Oxford.

H. P. No. 534: An Act to establish daily limit on fish in C. Pond, in Township C Surplus, Oxford County (H. P. No. 534) (H. Doc. No. 250.)

H. P. No. 536: An Act to regulate ice fishing in Long Pond, in the towns of Somerville and Jefferson, in the county of Lincoln, and in the town of Windsor, in the county of Kennebec.

At this point, Mr. Wing of Auburn assumed the Chair, amid the applause of the House.

Passed to Be Engrossed

S. P. No. 111: An Act prohibiting ice fishing in Kennebank Pond, in the county of York.

S. P. No. 128: An Act to amend Chapter 62 of the Public Laws of 1923, relating to the Production and Sale of Certified Seed.

S. P. No. 188: An Act to amend

Section 5 of Chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by Chapter 66 of the Public Laws of 1919, relating to the registration of milk dealers.

S. F. No. 58: Resolve for double stacking the State Library.

S. F. No. 161: Joint Resolution favoring the acquiring and maintenance by the United States Government of a suitable Vessel, constructed and equipped especially as an ice breaker, to be stationed and operated solely on the Maine Coast.

Orders of the Day

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House for its consideration report of the committee on Commerce on bill, an act in relation to standard time, being House Paper No. 7 (H. D. No. 6), and the clerk will please read the report of the committee.

(The Clerk read the report.)

The SPEAKER pro tem: The question is on the acceptance of the report of the committee in new draft, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale.

Mr. HALE of Portland: Mr. Speaker and members of the House: I move the rejection of the committee report for reasons which I will outline briefly; and I wish, first, to call the attention of the members to the new draft which is House Document 260, and is among the printed bills which were laid on your desks this morning. As the bill is brief, I should like to call attention to its language, as follows:

"Section 1. That, within the State of Maine, the Standard time shall be based on the mean astronomical time of the seventy-fifth degree of longitude west from Greenwich, known and designated by the Federal statute as "United States Standard Eastern Time," a similar provision to that is now on the statute books. The bill goes on: "It shall be unlawful for any town or other municipality to vote for, or otherwise establish any other system of time."

"Section 2. The supreme judicial court in equity, by writ of injunction or otherwise, may restrain or annul proceedings in any town or city in violation of the preceding section, upon application of ten or more taxable citizens of the State and a writ of temporary injunction

may issue forthwith without filing of a bond by such petitions."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that in voting on this report the issue will not be confused. The issue is not whether standard time is better time than daylight saving time, or whether daylight saving time is better than standard time, because, on that question, I think there is no doubt in this House—no question in the minds of most of the members—that they prefer standard time and they have every right to prefer it. The only question is whether any town or municipality may, in its discretion, by the vote of its citizens, establish some other time, and I am speaking on the question because it is of great interest to the citizens of the city of Portland which I represent.

Ever since the war, every year in December, the citizens of that city have taken a vote on the question of whether in that city they would establish the daylight saving system of time—in other words set the clock an hour ahead; and every year they have voted to do so, and last year they voted to do so by a vote of two to one.

It does not seem to me to be relevant to discuss the considerations which were in the minds of the citizens of Portland when they so voted. I am willing to assume for the purposes of this argument that two-thirds of the citizens of Portland in voting for daylight saving time were absolute idiots. The fact remains that they so voted, and I would like this Legislature to give effect to the will of the citizens of Portland as so expressed. It seems to me it is merely a question of home rule. It seems to be that it is rather a local question for the citizens of Portland. I know that perhaps many of you are thinking that this is not a local question for the citizens of Portland in establishing daylight saving time to the confusion of travelers and other citizens of the State. It may be that daylight saving time in Portland causes a little confusion to people who live outside the city. It causes a little confusion to people who live inside the city, and the presence of that confusion is a consideration in the minds of the people when they vote on the question in Portland. Nevertheless, in spite of the confusion, which I think bears

more on us than on residents of other parts of the State, the citizens of Portland do vote for the other system of time. A certain amount of confusion in railway schedules seems to be unavoidable because the State of Massachusetts on the west has the daylight saving system, the Province of New Brunswick on the east has another system, and in Montreal and the Province of Quebec they have daylight saving; so that I cannot feel that whatever the city of Portland chooses to do at its municipal election can have very serious effect on the rest of the State, and if it does not have a very serious effect on the rest of the State, I would ask the members of this House to allow the citizens of Portland to express their will on this question at the polls.

Gentlemen have asked me in private conversation whether the result of daylight saving time could not be accomplished by people getting up earlier in the morning. Undoubtedly those results could be so accomplished; but the point is that it operates for the greater convenience and uniformity of life in a city for a uniform standard of time to be observed by the city as a whole, otherwise certain individuals will operate their business and their private affairs on the one schedule and other individuals will operate on the other, so that the result will be a confusion, it seems to me, greater than the confusion which this bill seeks to eliminate. On this question it would seem to me that our motto might be "Live and let live." The citizens of Portland are certainly not seeking to impose their particular ideas of their own convenience upon the rest of the State, and I hope that the rest of the State will be similarly indulgent to them.

Mr. HARRIMAN of Readfield: Mr. Speaker, in regard to this daylight saving bill, as it is called, it seems to me that it is hardly necessary to say anything at this time only that perhaps the full significance of the feeling in Portland has not been fully expressed. A gentleman from Portland came here to the House some two weeks ago and said that he had got a Senator from Cumberland county to introduce him to me, saying that he wanted to see the author of the daylight bill. He said I want to assure you, Mr. Harriman, that Portland is by no means two-

thirds in favor of this measure. It was brought out at the hearing, I believe, as stated by the gentlemen from Portland who appeared at that hearing, that on the referendum vote two-thirds of the people voted for it. According to the vote, no doubt that is true, because something like six thousand voted for and four thousand against it, when as a matter of fact there were twenty-one thousand people who voted in the September election; and if you can judge of general conditions from that, only fifty percent of the people voted anyway. So it would seem, that a very small majority of the people of Portland, even, want standard time. The gentleman who took the pains to come and meet me said that the business men of Portland are opposed to it. He said that during the war, when it was a nation-wide issue in the interests of winning the war, that everybody was willing to do anything to help win the war and it was "put across" as a nation-wide issue, with everybody having a chance to work in their war gardens. Today it is simply the clerks and an element of people who want more time to play golf and ride in their automobiles who wish the extra hour of daylight time. It seems to me that very little need be said on this matter because the sentiment of the people all over the State is well known in regard to this time, and I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Portland (Mr. Hale) will not prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The gentleman from Portland, Mr. Hale, moves that the House Report ought to pass in new draft on House Document No. 6 be rejected. As many as are in favor of the motion will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to reject the House Report failed of passage.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, I now move, if in order, the acceptance of the House Report.

Mr. PIERCE of Sanford: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that retabled and especially assigned for Tuesday next.

A viva voce vote being doubted, A division of the House was had, Thirty-two voting in the affirmative and 87 in the negative, the motion of the gentleman from Sanford, Mr. Pierce, to re-table, was lost.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The ques-

tion now is on the motion of the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Harriman, to accept the report of the committee, of the bill in new draft.

A viva voce vote being taken, the report was accepted.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The bill having been printed, the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Harriman, now moves that the rules be suspended and that this bill have its first two readings at this time.

Mr. OAKES of Portland: Mr. Speaker, this is a new bill before us this morning, and it does seem as though the people from Portland should have an opportunity to examine it, and I move that the matter lie on the table in its present status and be specially assigned for Tuesday next.

Mr. HARRIMAN: Mr. Speaker, is that motion debatable?

The SPEAKER pro tem: It is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Portland, Mr. Oakes, that this matter lie on the table and be especially assigned for Tuesday next. As many as are in favor will say aye; those opposed will say no.

A viva voce vote being taken, the motion to retable was lost; and on motion by the gentleman from Readfield, Mr. Harriman, and a further viva voce vote being taken, the rules were suspended, the bill had its two several readings and tomorrow was assigned for its third reading.

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair lays before the House majority and minority reports of the Committee on Sea and Shore fisheries on bill, an act relating to the Commissioner of Sea and Shore Fisheries, H. P. No. 128 (H. D. 29) tabled by the gentleman from Sedgwick, Mr. Sargent, March 4th, pending the acceptance of either report, and the clerk will read the reports.

(The clerk reads the reports).

The SPEAKER pro tem: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sedgwick, Mr. Sargent.

Mr. SARGENT: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I would like to retable these two reports with the understanding that they will be considered on the same day as the report tabled by the gentleman from South Portland, Mr. Lamson, on an act relating to the legal size of lobsters.