

# 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-Second Legislature*

OF THE

STATE OF MAINE

1945

DAILY KENNEBEC JOURNAL

AUGUSTA, MAINE

## SENATE

Wednesday, April 11, 1945.

The Senate was called to order by the President.

Prayer by the Reverend Cleaves Henderson of Gardiner.

Journal of yesterday read and approved.

From the House:

"Bill "An Act Relating to the Practice of Dentistry." (H. P. 734) (L. D. 372)

(In the Senate, on April 4th, passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in concurrence.)

Comes from the House engrossing reconsidered, House Amendment "B" adopted, and the bill as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B" passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook, the Senate voted to recede from its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; House Amendment B was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as amended by House Amendments A and B was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Accomplish Conformity to State School Building Standards." (S. P. 197) (L. D. 487)

(In the Senate on March 21st, passed to be engrossed.)

Comes from the House indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

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

Bill "An Act Relating to Prenatal Examinations." (S. P. 216) (L. D. 468)

(In the Senate, on March 27th passed to be engrossed.)

Comes from the House, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate on motion by Miss Clough of Penobscot, the Senate voted to recede from its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was indefinitely postponed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Pari-Mutuel Pools." (S. P. 416) (L. D. 1111)

(In the Senate on April 6th passed to be engrossed.)

Comes from the House passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A" in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Senate voted to recede from its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed; and on further motion by the same Senator, House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Simplify Finances of the Department of Education." (S. P. 191) (L. D. 490)

(In the Senate on April 3rd, passed to be engrossed as amended by Committee Amendment "A".)

Comes from the House, indefinitely postponed in non-concurrence.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Owen of Kennebec, the Senate voted to insist on its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, and ask for a Committee of Conference.

## House Committee Reports

The Committee on State Hospitals on Bill "An Act Relating to Expenses of Patients in State Hospitals." (H. P. 1219) (L. D. 769) reported that the same ought to pass.

Comes from the House, indefinitely postponed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook, the Senate voted to indefinitely postpone the bill in concurrence.

The Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Lincoln Municipal Court." (H. P. 678) (L. D. 326) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1434) (L. D. 1122) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

Comes from the House, report indefinitely postponed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Denney of Lincoln, the Senate voted to indefinitely postpone the bill in concurrence.

The Committee on Sea and Shore Fisheries on "Resolve to Create a Commission to Study the Atlantic Salmon," (H. P. 1302) (L. D. 947) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1436) (L. D. 1120) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

Comes from the House, report adopted and resolve passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "B".

In the Senate, the report was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading; House Amendment "B" was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Employer-Employee Agreements Under the Workmen's Compensation Act," (H. P. 1139) (L. D. 694) reported that the same ought not to pass.

The Committee on Taxation on Bill "An Act Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution to Exempt all Intangible Property from Taxation," (H. P. 1264) (L. D. 887) reported that the same ought not to pass.

Which reports were severally read and adopted in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Limitation of the Financial Responsibility Law," (H. P. 242) (L. D. 87) reported the same in a new draft, (H. P. 1409) (L. D. 1109) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(Signed)  
Senators:

DOW of Oxford  
DUNBAR of Washington

Representatives:

PERKINS of Boothbay Harbor

WARD of Millinocket  
HASKELL of Portland  
CONNELLAN of Portland  
PASCUCCI of Sanford

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

(Signed)  
Senator:

CLOUGH of Penobscot

Representatives:

WILLIAMS of Auburn  
PEIRCE of Augusta

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted, and the bill in new draft passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate:

Mr. DOW of Oxford: Mr. President, I move adoption of the Majority Report.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Boucher of Androscoggin, the reports and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion to adopt the Majority Report in concurrence.

The Majority of the Committee on Ways and Bridges on "Resolve in Favor of a Bridge Across the St. John River," (H. P. 1101) (L. D. 786) reported that the same ought not to pass.

(Signed)

Senators:

HALL of Franklin  
DORR of Oxford

Representatives:

DOW of Eliot  
LACKEE of Addison  
BOULIER of Stacyville  
WOOD of Webster  
DEAN of South Portland  
COLE of West Gardiner

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter reported that the same ought to pass.

(Signed)

Senator:

BROWN of Aroostook

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted.

In the Senate:

Mr. DORR of Oxford: Mr. President, I move adoption of the Majority Report in concurrence.

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook, the reports and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion by the Senator from Oxford, Senator Dorr, to adopt the Majority Report in concurrence, and especially assigned for tomorrow morning.

The Majority of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act Amending the Charter of the City of Biddeford," (H. P. 733) (L. D. 402) reported that the same ought to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

BATCHELDER of York  
LEAVITT of Cumberland  
GOULD of Androscoggin

## Representatives:

PAYSON of Portland  
 RANKIN of Bridgton  
 WEEKS of Waterville  
 SNOW of Auburn  
 WELCH of Mars Hill  
 WARREN of Westbrook

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

(signed)

## Representative:

DONAHUE of Biddeford

Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed.

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Batchelder, the Senate voted to adopt the Majority Report in concurrence, and the bill was given its first reading, and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Banks and Banking on Bill "An Act to Incorporate the 'Guardian Loan Co.," (H. P. 794) (L. D. 432) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1456) (L. D. 1156) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act to Authorize Outside Audit of State Books," (H. P. 719) (L. D. 387) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1457) (L. D. 1157) under the same title and that it ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Welch of Aroostook, tabled pending adoption of the report in concurrence.)

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Designating Certain Academies as High Schools," (H. P. 1176) (L. D. 738) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1458) (L. D. 1158) under a new title, Bill "An Act Designating Certain Academies as High Schools and Relating to Membership in the Maine Teachers' Retirement System," and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Membership in the Maine Teachers' Retirement System," (H. P. 822) (L. D. 426) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1449) (L. D. 1138) under a new title, Bill "An Act Relating to the Forwarding of Contributions in the Maine Teachers' Retirement System" and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game on Bill "An Act Relating to Open Season for Hunting," (H. P. 945) (L. D. 574) reported the same in a new draft

(H. P. 1451) (L. D. 1139) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Judiciary on Bill "An Act Relating to Vital Statistics," (H. P. 1216) (L. D. 851) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1454) (L. D. 1140) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of Various Officers of Waldo County," (H. P. 735) (L. D. 403) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1459) (L. D. 1159) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Automobile Travel by State Employees," (H. P. 737) (L. D. 405) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1461) (L. D. 1161) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Register of Probate of Kennebec County and Clerk Hire in Such Office," (H. P. 105) (L. D. 36) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1374) (L. D. 1037) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Inland Fisheries and Game to which was recommended "Resolve Opening Squa Pan Lake in Castle Hill, Masardis and Township 11, Range 4, to Ice Fishing," ((H. P. 513) (L. D. 203) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1450) (L. D. 1146) under a new title, "Resolve Relating to Fishing in Aroostook and Piscataquis Counties," and that it ought to pass.

The Committee on Claims on "Resolve, in Favor of Catherine A. Nason of Round Pond," (H. P. 194) (L. D. 1142) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve to Reimburse Wallagrass Plantation for Support of the Family of Edward Berube," (H. P. 498) (L. D. 1143) reported that the same ought to pass.

The same Committee on "Resolve, in Favor of Fox & Ginn, Inc.," (H. P. 1314) (L. D. 1144) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to Fees of Sheriffs and Expenses in Keeping Prisoners," (H. P. 994) (L. D. 594) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Ways and Bridges on Bill "An Act Relating

to Maintenance of State Highways and State Aid Roads," (H. P. 240) (L. D. 98) reported that the same ought to pass.

The Committee on Salaries and Fees on Bill "An Act Relating to Clerk Hire in the Lincoln Municipal Court," (H. P. 677) (L. D. 325) reported that the same ought to pass.

(On motion by Mr. Denny of Lincoln tabled pending adoption of the report in concurrence.)

The same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Salary for Clerks in County Offices in Lincoln County," (H. P. 1096) (L. D. 783) reported that the same ought to pass.

Which reports were severally read and adopted in concurrence, the bills and resolves read once and tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Education on Bill "An Act Relating to the Permanent School Fund," (H. P. 937) (L. D. 540) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

(On motion by Mr. Sterling of Somerset, the report and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending adoption of Committee Amendment A in concurrence.)

The Majority of the Committee on Legal Affairs on Bill "An Act to Grant a New Charter to the City of Rockland," (H. P. 149) (L. D. 51) reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1425) (L. D. 1113) under the same title, and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Senators:

BATCHELDER of York  
LEAVITT of Cumberland  
GOULD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

WELCH of Mars Hill  
RAYSON of Portland  
RANKIN of Bridgton  
WEEKS of Waterville  
WARREN of Westbrook  
SNOW of Auburn

The Minority of the same Committee on the same subject matter

reported the same in a new draft (H. P. 1426) with Committee Amendment "A" and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Representative:

DONAHUE of Biddeford  
Comes from the House, the Majority Report read and adopted, and the bill passed to be engrossed as amended by House Amendment "A".

In the Senate, on motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Majority Report was read and adopted in concurrence and the bill was given its first reading; House Amendment A was read and adopted in concurrence, and the bill as so amended tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Committee on Claims on the following Resolves:

S. P. 89, L. D. 132. Resolve in Favor of the Central Maine General Hospital of Lewiston.

S. P. 127, L. D. 332. Resolve in Favor of Hospice Marcotte of Lewiston.

H. P. 144. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Prospect for Hospitalization and Medical Aid for Mrs. John Burke.

H. P. 309. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Etna for Supplies and Medical Aid Furnished to Arthur Clewley and Family.

H. P. 311. Resolve in Favor of Elias E. Tucker, of Mechanic Falls.

H. P. 313. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Sherman for Pauper Bills of Inhabitants of Silver Ridge Plantation.

H. P. 315. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Millinocket for Support of Mrs. Florence Griffin and Family.

H. P. 316. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Millinocket for Pauper Assistance Furnished Mrs. Eva Blackstone.

H. P. 415. Resolve in Favor of George E. McDonald, of Portland.

H. P. 623, L. D. 286. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Lisbon for Support of Arthur Pulk and Carroll Pulk.

H. P. 626. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Frankfort for Funeral Expenses of State Charges.

H. P. 798. Resolve to Reimburse the Town of Masardis for Hospitalization of Lindley Chase.

H. P. 799. Resolve in Favor of the Town of Portage Lake for Medi-

cal Aid Furnished to David Coty Family.

H. P. 922, L. D. 562. Resolve in Favor of the City of Eastport for the Care of William Price.

H. P. 924, L. D. 537. Resolve in favor of the Eastern Maine General Hospital of Bangor.

H. P. 1049, L. D. 656. Resolve to Reimburse the City of Bangor for Supplies Furnished Various Individuals.

Reported the same in a Consolidated Resolve, (H. P. 1448) (L. D. 1145) under title of "Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Pauper Claims," and that it ought to pass.

Which report was read and adopted and the bill in new draft passed to be engrossed.

#### First Reading of a Printed Bill

Bill "An Act Relating to Fees of Registers of Probate in re Petitions." (S. P. 437) (L. D. 1155)

Which bill was read once, and on motion by Mr. Hall of Franklin was laid upon the table pending assignment for second reading.

#### Senate Committee Reports

Mr. Hopkins from the Committee on Labor submitted its Final Report.

Which was read and adopted.  
Sent down for concurrence.

Mr. Townsend from the Committee on Temperance submitted its Final Report.

Which was read and adopted.  
Sent down for concurrence.

Miss Clough from the Committee on Public Health on Bill "An Act Relating to Public Health," (S. P. 212) (L. D. 471) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

On motion by Miss Clough, the bill was laid upon the table pending adoption of the report.

The same Senator from the same Committee on Bill "An Act Relating to Local Health Officers," (H. P. 213) (L. D. 472) reported that the same ought to pass as amended by Committee Amendment "A".

Which report was read and adopted, and the bill read once; Committee Amendment "A" was read:

"Committee Amendment A to S. P. 213, L. D. 472. Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following section: 'Section 4. R. S. Chapt. 22, Sec. 38 amended. The last sentence of Section 38, Chapter 22 is hereby amended to read as follows: "He shall devote his entire time to the performance of his duties and shall receive 1-3 of his salary but not more than \$1500 a year from the state."'

Which amendment was adopted and the bill as so amended was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

The Majority of the Committee on Judiciary on "Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution Providing for Permanent Sites and Locations of Public Wharves and Port Facilities," (S. P. 168) (L. D. 347) reported the same in a new draft (S. P. 444) under a new title, "Resolve Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution so as to Provide for a \$10,500,000 Bond Issue for the Purposes of Building and Maintaining Public Wharves and for the Establishment of Adequate Port Facilities and Fish Piers in the Cities of Portland and Rockland in the State of Maine, Including Permanent Sites and Locations," and that it ought to pass.

(signed)

Representatives:

WILLIAMS of Auburn  
WARD of Millinocket  
HASKELL of Portland  
CONNELLAN of Portland  
PEIRCE of Augusta  
PASCUCCI of Sanford

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

(signed)

Senators:

DOW of Oxford  
DUNBAR of Washington  
CLOUGH of Penobscot

Representatives:

PERKINS of Boothbay Harbor

On motion by Mr. Spear of Cumberland, the report and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending adoption of either report and the new draft ordered printed.

#### Passed to be Engrossed

"Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Land in

Aroostook County to George Emile Daigle and Adrian Daigle." (H. P. 348) (L. D. 155)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Recorder of the Bath Municipal Court." (H. P. 642) (L. D. 295)

Bill "An Act to Confer Concurrent Jurisdiction on the Probate Court and Superior Court in Matters Concerning Custody and Support of Minor Children." (H. P. 818) (L. D. 506)

"Resolve in Favor of Cornelius E. Conley, of Lewiston." (H. P. 1054) (L. D. 659)

"Resolve in Favor of the Town of Smyrna." (H. P. 12228) (L. D. 852)

"Resolve in Favor of Town of Greenville to Correct Height of Overpass of the Canadian Pacific Railroad at Greenville Junction." (H. P. 1312) (L. D. 961)

Bill "An Act Relating to Fishing in Certain Rivers, Lakes and Ponds in Oxford County." (H. P. 1440) (L. D. 1130)

Bill "An Act to Amend the Employees' Contributory Retirement System." (H. P. 1441) (L. D. 1131)

Bill "An Act Relating to Reporting by Drivers Involved in Accidents." (H. P. 1444) (L. D. 1133)

Bill "An Act to Provide a Town Council and Manager Form of Government for the Town of Limestone in the County of Aroostook." (H. P. 1445) (L. D. 1134)

Bill "An Act Relating to Public Safety Commission for Rumbold Falls Village Corporation." (H. P. 1446) (L. D. 1135)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Recorder of the Bath Municipal Court." (H. P. 1447) (L. D. 1136)

"Resolve Providing for the Payment of Certain Damages Caused by Protected Wild Animals." (H. P. 1427) (L. D. 1107)

Bill "An Act to Establish the Western Oxford Municipal Court." (H. P. 515) (L. D. 204)

Bill "An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law as to Benefits." (H. P. 1232) (L. D. 858)

Bill "An Act Relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Municipal Court of Bath." (H. P. 1432) (L. D. 1115)

Which bills and resolves were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to School Superintendents." (S. P. 431) (L. D. 1151)

Bill "An Act Relating to Powers of Attorney and Other Instruments by Persons in the Armed Forces." (S. P. 432) (L. D. 1148)

Bill "An Act Relating to Public Administrators." (S. P. 433) (L. D. 1150)

Bill "An Act to Incorporate the 'General Mortgage Company.'" (S. P. 434) (L. D. 1152)

"Resolve Providing for an Interim Commission to Study Methods to Assure Greater Productivity of the Forest Lands of the State." (S. P. 435) (L. D. 1149)

"Resolve, Providing for Purchase of Land for the Pownal State School." (S. P. 436) (L. D. 1153)

Which bills and resolves were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

Bill "An Act Relating to Snow Removal." (H. P. 247) (L. D. 157)

Bill "An Act Relating to Inheritance Taxes." (H. P. 1385) (L. D. 1046)

Which bills were severally read a second time and passed to be engrossed, as amended, in concurrence.

Bill "An Act to Create the Town Road Improvement Fund." (S. P. 352) (L. D. 891)

Which bill was read a second time and passed to be engrossed.

Sent down for concurrence.

#### Passed to be Enacted

An Act relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Kennebunk Municipal Court (S. P. 123) (L. D. 222)

An Act Permitting Members of the Armed Forces to Receive Operators' Licenses Without Payment of Fees (S. P. 325) (L. D. 826)

An Act relating to Applications for Operators' Licenses by Members of the Armed Forces (S. P. 326) (L. D. 825)

An Act Increasing the Salaries of the County Attorney and Assistant County Attorney of Androscoggin County (S. P. 359) (L. D. 904)

An Act to Increase the Salary of the Register of Probate in Penobscot County (S. P. 400) (L. D. 1040)

An Act relating to the Salary for Clerks in the Office of Register of Probate in York County (H. P. 48) (L. D. 19)

An Act relating to the Amount to be Paid for Clerk Hire in the



Office of the Recorder of the Municipal Court of the City of Portland (H. P. 102) (L. D. 33)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Judge of the Municipal Court of Portland (H. P. 103) (L. D. 34)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Recorder of the Portland Municipal Court (H. P. 104) (L. D. 35)

An Act to Increase the Amount to be Paid for Clerk Hire in the Office of Register of Probate in the County of Cumberland (H. P. 192) (L. D. 56)

An Act Providing for Equitable Apportionment of Estate Taxes and Collection and Payment Thereof (H. P. 422) (L. D. 192)

An Act to Provide for the Issuance of Bonds of the State to Refund Waldo-Hancock Bridge Loan Bonds (H. P. 618) (L. D. 281)

An Act to Provide for the Issuance of Bonds of the State to Refund Kennebec Bridge Loan Bonds (H. P. 619) (L. D. 282)

An Act relating to Decrees for Alimony (H. P. 747) (L. D. 390)

An Act relating to the Aeronautics Commission (H. P. 789) (L. D. 430)

An Act to Equalize Opportunities for Education in Occupational Training (H. P. 804) (L. D. 501)

An Act relating to Settlement of Suits By or Against Infants (H. P. 1137) (L. D. 681)

An Act relating to the Salaries of the Judge and Recorder of the Northern Cumberland Municipal Court (H. P. 1149) (L. D. 795)

An Act relating to Inactive Savings Accounts of Former Inmates of the State School for Boys (H. P. 1164) (L. D. 685)

An Act relating to Appointment of State Humane Agents (H. P. 1166) (L. D. 687)

An Act to Provide Civil Service Rules for Police and Fire Departments (H. P. 1201) (L. D. 760)

An Act relating to Rate of Speed of Commercial Vehicles (H. P. 1210) (L. D. 711)

An Act to Grant Powers of Arrest to State Parole Officers (H. P. 1271) (L. D. 914)

An Act relating to Clerk Hire in Office of Register of Deeds in Penobscot County (H. P. 1375) (L. D. 1038)

An Act relating to Special Legislative Pensions (H. P. 1383) (L. D. 1045)

An Act relating to Advertising Resources, Etc., by Arrostook County (H. P. 1393) (L. D. 1065)

An Act to Increase Teachers' Pensions (H. P. 1394) (L. D. 1066)

An Act relating to Control of Deer in Acadia National Park (H. P. 1395) (L. D. 1067)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Judge of Probate and the Register of Probate in Cumberland County (H. P. No. 1397) (L. D. No. 1068)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Sheriff of York County (H. P. No. 1398) (L. D. No. 1069)

An Act relating to the Salary of the Sheriff of Oxford County (H. P. No. 1399) (L. D. No. 1070)

An Act relative to the Salary of the Judge of the Brunswick Municipal Court (H. P. No. 1400) (L. D. No. 1071)

An Act relating to Salary of Sheriff of Cumberland County (H. P. No. 1403) (L. D. No. 1074)

An Act to Increase the Salary of the Judge of the Rumford Falls Municipal Court (H. P. No. 1404) (L. D. No. 1075)

An Act relating to Liquor Licenses in Unorganized Territory Where No Elections are Held (H. P. No. 1405) (L. D. No. 1076)

An Act relating to Selling of Malt Liquor Near National Soldiers' Homes, Etc. (H. P. No. 1406) (L. D. No. 1077)

An Act relating to Records of Educational Institutions (H. P. No. 1411) (L. D. No. 1084)

An Act relating to Alternative Method for the Enforcement of Liens for Taxes on Real Estate (H. P. No. 1414) (L. D. No. 1086)

An Act relating to License Fees for Amusement Shows (H. P. No. 1415) (L. D. No. 1087)

An Act relating to Permits for Digging Into and Opening Streets and Highways (H. P. No. 1416) (L. D. No. 1088)

An Act relating to Pauper Settlement (H. P. No. 1417) (L. D. No. 1089)

### Finally Passed

Resolve in favor of Mrs. Doris G. Cummings of Perry (S. P. No. 401) (L. D. No. 1041)

Resolve in favor of Alphonso S. Dube of Togus (S. P. No. 402) (L. D. No. 1043)

Resolve in favor of Velma Norton of Caribou (S. P. No. 403) (L. D. No. 1042)

Resolve Appropriating Money to Repair Fish Screen at Eagle Lake (H. P. No. 322) (L. D. No. 143)

Resolve Authorizing the Forest Commissioner to Convey Certain Interest of the State in Lands in

Oxford County to Fred L. Edwards, of Bethel (H. P. No. 1007) (L. D. No. 555)

Resolve in favor of Dr. Charles H. Buck, of Naples (H. P. No. 1378) (L. D. 1048)

Resolve in favor of the Estate of R. Byron Flewelling, Late of West Gardiner, Deceased; for Loss of Life (H. P. No. 1379) (L. D. No. 1049)

Resolve in favor of Charles B. Buck, of Newfield (H. P. No. 1380) (L. D. No. 1050)

Resolve to Reimburse the town of Amherst for Suppression of a Forest Fire (H. P. No. 1381) (L. D. No. 1051)

Resolve Granting a State Pension to Eva M. Farrington Clary, of Bowdoinham (H. P. No. 1384) (L. D. No. 1052)

Resolve for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Year Nineteen Hundred Forty-six (H. P. No. 1391) (L. D. No. 1079)

Resolve in favor of William A. Johnson, of Orrington (H. P. No. 1392) (L. D. No. 1080)

Resolve relating to Daily Bag Limit from Androscoggin Watershed above Middle Dam (H. P. No. 1396) (L. D. No. 1081)

Bill "An Act Relating to Penalty for Obstructing Commissioner of Agriculture in Performance of Duty." (S. P. 392) (L. D. 1015)

"Resolve, in Favor of Mary Louise Bernier, of Sanford." (H. P. 1053) (L. D. 802)

#### Emergency Measure

Bill "An Act Providing for the Taking of Property by the State by Right of Eminent Domain." (H. P. 1413) (L. D. 1085)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 30 members of the Senate and none opposed was passed to be enacted.

#### Emergency Measure

"Resolve, for the Laying of the County Taxes for the Year Nineteen Hundred Forty-Five." (H. P. 1390) (L. D. 1078)

Which bill being an emergency measure and having received the affirmative vote of 29 members of the Senate, and none opposed was finally passed.

#### Orders of the Day

On motion by Mr. Cleaves of Cumberland, the Senate voted to

take from the table, Bill, An Act Relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles (S. P. 423) (L. D. 1121) tabled by that Senator on April 5th pending assignment for second reading.

Mr. CLEAVES: Mr. President, I am about to offer an amendment to this bill but before doing so I want to explain to the Senate the reason for my doing it. Our Motor Vehicles Committee has reported "Ought to Pass" on this. They are fully in favor of it and recognized the necessity of removing a tariff barrier at the line and giving our business men a chance to increase their markets. This was good judgment and good legislation. They have put on this new draft very wisely a two year limitation. This is also good legislation. They have also put on it a 20,000 pound maximum gross weight. I think they believed it was an excellent idea, and in fact, I thought so, myself. They are not experts in trucking, and the Lord knows I am not either, but after several days it became known this 20,000 pound regulation was put on and I received protests from all over the state of Maine from farmers, truckmen, fishermen and lumbermen, and every man doing business in trucking, and finally it was explained to me it did not fill the bill. In addition to this, I began to get protests from other states who did not show an indication of going along with us in a reciprocal way, and so, Mr. President, I present Senate Amendment "A" and move its adoption:

Senate Amendment "A" to S. P. 423, L. D. 1121, Bill "An Act Relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles."

Amend said Bill by striking out, in the 8th line of section 2 thereof, the following underlined words: "other than a foreign corporation doing business in this state."

Further amend said Bill by striking out, in the 9th and 10th lines of section 2 thereof, the following underlined words: "other than the operator of any such vehicle belonging to a foreign corporation doing business in this state."

Further amend said Bill by striking out all of section 5 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following:

"Sec. 5. Limitation. The provisions of this act shall become effective on January 1, 1946 and shall

remain in force until December 31, 1947, inclusive. It is the intent of the legislature to change the present statute until and including December 31, 1947, at which time the present statute shall return to full force and effect.'

Mr. CROSS of Kennebec: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, as Chairman of the Committee on Motor Vehicles, I feel it is my duty to lay before the Senate the reason for passing out the new draft in its present form.

This is a very far reaching piece of legislation. I don't think many of us realize just how far. It is a measure that the committee has discussed very thoroughly and in their considered judgment the report in new draft was put forth.

There are a number of angles I think we should take into consideration when we vote on this amendment. The principle of reciprocity I do not think is involved. It is perhaps self-evident that the Committee on Motor Vehicles believe in the principles of reciprocity although I believe Webster would say that reciprocity is a mutual giving. I have always believed, personally, we would give more than we would receive under reciprocity but under the able arguments of the proponents I have changed my mind and feel under a long range program the State will benefit more than it will lose. However, considering the thing from the angle of the state's revenue and the immediate repercussions, the committee felt they should be cautious and report this out with a two year limitation and see just how much damage it would do for two years. In fact, it would only have actually about one year as it can not go into effect until January 1, 1946. Therefore, we felt with one year trial we would have some figures, some definite figures as to how much the State would lose.

However, there is another angle, a very important angle, I believe besides the money angle, and one which is very definitely hard to pin down, and that is the argument of maintenance of our roads and as to how much the heavy trucks do toward breaking up our roads in the spring. I do not believe there is much argument there. Anyone who has followed one of the big trailer trucks over the road when it is soft and have seen the surface fly to pieces under their tires,

knows what the big trucks do to the road. Of course, the smaller ones also do damage. Anything that goes over them in the spring of the year help to punish the roads. We, therefore, felt the limitation of the gross weight might be of benefit this first year and that we would have to soften the blow, as it were, to highway revenues and also to maintenance of roads. So we put on the limitation of 20,000 pounds gross weight, thinking it would bring under reciprocity the majority of those who would ask for relief.

At the public hearing practically all of the proponents who were there were small business men, farmers, ones who apparently did not operate the heavy trucks. There were almost no representatives from the heavy trucking interests. They appeared to be more or less split on reciprocity but we did have a large turnout of fishermen, packing houses, farmers, apple men and the like, and we felt this limitation which would be approximately the same as the six-ton truck limitation in our state would take care of those men and still keep from our roads the influx of the heavy truck trailer. We may have been wrong in our assumption, but that is the reason we put the limitation on the gross weight.

If this amendment should fail of passage I have one here to offer which would apply to trucks having a rated capacity of six tons or less which I understand would make it easier to enforce from the standpoint of the State Police and the Secretary of State's department.

However, those are the reasons and the only reasons I know of for passing out any new draft, but I leave it entirely to the members of the Senate as to which they think best.

Mr. HOWES of Penobscot: Mr. President and members of the Senate, I have always thought all my life how nice it would be to register a car and go anywhere we want to. I ship a good many truck loads of cattle out of the state and I have had to take them to Kittery and walk across the bridge and get a truck on the other side and I have been put to a lot of inconvenience and I know a lot of other people have.

I do not consider we have any roads at this time. Our roads the last eight or ten years have been

washed away and nothing much has been done on them. If we had the roads they have in Massachusetts I would vote for this hands down. Here in Maine we have 22,864 miles of road. Massachusetts has 17,397. I have been all over Massachusetts and they really have roads up there and they have taxable property and something to build the roads with and they have trucks that will go there and not hurt their roads a bit. It stands to reason they will have ten trucks come in to Maine while we have one go up there.

The population of Maine is 847,226. The population of Massachusetts is 4,316,721. Just imagine what they will do to us if they come here with those terrible trucks on a lot of the roads we have. Down around Portland they have better roads than we have up my way. If they could come to Portland or around Cumberland County it would be all right but when you turn them loose in the counties out back here, I tell you they will do a lot of damage.

Mr. Woodman told me that the minute this is passed we will lose \$94,000. We have not \$94,000 to lose right now. We all know the highways have taken a terrible beating the last few years. Our roads have gone to pieces the last few years. There is no money to get them back where they were. It will be a long time before that can be done. I am against letting these trucks in.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I move that Senate Amendment be indefinitely postponed. In support of that motion I want to state to the members of the Senate why I am against full reciprocity which is what this amendment really means.

I believe that reciprocity is tied together with your highway program and needs to be considered along with that program. I am very thankful for the discussions we had here yesterday afternoon concerning the highway program and the financial situation, and I feel that each member of this Senate must realize that we have not sufficient funds in our Highway Department to carry out the program that every one of us would like to see carried out.

I want to tell you just briefly why we are in that situation. We have in the State of Maine almost 23,000 miles of highway. We have in the State of Maine 850,000 people. In

speaking of reciprocity, the State of Massachusetts and the State of Maine would be considered together since the greater part of the arguments for reciprocity is that Maine trucks go into Boston, into Massachusetts for this, that, or the other, which I will say is entirely desirable. I am not in favor of trade barriers but let us look at the state of Massachusetts and see what they are doing. They have in Massachusetts 17,000 miles of highway and they have a population of 4,400,000 as given in the census of 1940. They have a large number of trucks and a large number of passenger cars and a large highway revenue.

In other words, the picture of the two states would sum up like this. In Maine we have 140 feet of highway for each individual. In Massachusetts they have 21 feet and I am trying to show you the highway burden on the people of Maine as compared to Massachusetts.

We have 140 feet of highway in Maine for each individual and 21 feet in Massachusetts. We have seven times the burden. The burden falls on every one of us seven times as hard as it does in Massachusetts.

In addition to that we have the problem of maintenance, which in Massachusetts they do not have to as great an extent as we do. As an illustration, in looking over the budget report from the Highway Commission, you will find we are spending \$1,250,000 a year in snow removal alone and as was stated here yesterday one item that takes up the largest part of available money is the item of maintenance and if you will note on your budget recommendation, that figure is very close to four million dollars a year. The gas tax yields on the present basis a little more than \$4,000,000 a year. In other words you had \$4,400,000 last year from the gas tax. Now figuring your 4c a gallon tax you will see that it takes more than 1c of each 4c for snow removal.

Speaking of snow removal and maintenance, what the state does is not all. Every one of us know that we go back home into our respective towns and each year in the month of March we appropriate money, raise money in our town meeting for the support of highways. The average tax on real estate amounts to between four and five million dollars a year. Now, I think it is self evident that our highway program is insufficient. We have high regis-

tration rates in the state of Maine to supplement our gas tax. In fact our registration rate in the State of Maine will average more than three times that of Massachusetts. A large truck in Massachusetts registers for \$60 and would be registered in Maine for \$300 and it seems to me that if we are unable to support a highway program with the high registration we have, if we allow trucks to use the Maine highways and pay no registration, it seems to me we are going to be that much worse off from the highway standpoint.

I say that principally, feeling that your maintenance costs are bound to rise with full reciprocity in Maine. I say that because if those large trucks use the Maine highways the cost of maintaining those highways will be increased and if you increase your maintenance cost in the state of Maine it is going to take that much money away from road construction and this road construction is needed especially in rural Maine, as we heard yesterday afternoon. In the matter of large trucks, there is no reciprocity between Maine and Massachusetts, in the number of trucks, in that we have only nine full trailers in Maine and Massachusetts has 77.

We have 167 small trailers in Maine and Massachusetts has 2300. Now this kind of vehicle is the freight car they put on the road that you and I try to get by on the highway and are very thankful when we do, and speaking of that, ladies and gentlemen, we should consider the out of state people who come in normal times to visit Maine.

Our roads to a great extent are narrow. How are the out of state visitors going to feel with the roads cluttered up with that kind of vehicle?

In other words, the Maine farmer who has his truck at home and whose roads are in such condition that he cannot get out of his doorway, is not going to find a four lane road in Massachusetts of much use to him.

As I understand it, the basic principle of highway construction, the basic financial principle is this. Those who use a highway should pay for the highway. That is the reason we have a gas tax. Massachusetts has a three cent gas tax and that three cent gas tax plus their registration fee for passenger

vehicles supports the Massachusetts highway program.

In other words you will find that the state of Massachusetts has diverted from its highway funds a million and a quarter dollars per year and they are receiving in truck registrations slightly more than that amount.

What I am trying to say is that if those trucks in Massachusetts paid nothing, they would still have enough to finance their highway program and a Maine truck going into Massachusetts and buying gas is supporting their road program. If a Massachusetts truck comes into Maine, and if they buy gas in Maine, and there is some question on that, but if they do buy enough for all the mileage they run on our roads they are not supporting our program because only about 35% of our highway program is based on the gas tax.

The point I am trying to make is this. If we, in Maine, will lower our registration fees by at least 50 percent and at the same time increase our gas tax so that our highway program will be based more upon the gas tax, resulting in the user of the highway paying for the road, then if the proponents of reciprocity come in with a reciprocity bill I will vote for it.

Mr. SMITH of Knox: Mr. President, I have not heard anything yet that changes my mind in regard to full reciprocity. In the first place, sometimes it is the little things that count. I have a couple of letters from granges back in the woods and they believe in full reciprocity. One of them says:

Evening Star Grange voted to accept following Resolutions at last regular meeting:

Be it resolved that Evening Star Grange of Washington, Maine, go on record as favoring the bill on Full Reciprocity.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senator of Knox County, and to the Representative of this district.

ARTHUR JOHNSTON

Executive Committee of Evening Star Grange.

I have another letter favoring full reciprocity. It is signed by twenty names.

Maine is the only state on the eastern seaboard which does not grant reciprocity privileges. If we are to have a prosperous postwar era in Maine, one of the things which we as legislators must do is to grant

complete reciprocity to out of state motor trucks and buses.

We are not going to lose any revenue from the passage of this bill but instead we stand to gain several thousands of dollars in additional truck registration fees if the measure is passed.

We are primarily a producing rather than a consuming state. More of our efforts are expended in producing raw materials than manufacturing. Our state enjoys a wealth of natural resources. Many of our products come from the land itself, such as lumber, potatoes, dairy products and other agricultural commodities. Other products, with which you are all familiar, come from the sea. We produce more of these things than we can possibly consume so therefore we have to look to markets outside of our own state in order to distribute these products. Washington County has become famous for its blueberry production. This industry is being held back, nevertheless, because of the difficulty of getting trucks which are properly registered in the several states to the south of us to haul blueberries to New York and other cities where the fanciest prices can be obtained.

Under a plan of complete reciprocity Maine farmers would be able to transport potatoes in their own trucks to the Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New York markets. Maine lumbermen would be able to take the products of Maine forests on their own trucks to market centers outside of our state.

Let us not be guilty of protecting a few by law; instead, let us in Maine join with the majority of the other states in our country in extending the hand of fellowship across the border to states which are willing to enter into agreements with us.

Gentlemen, I hope that in making your decision on how you shall vote on this all important bill, you will keep in mind what is for the best interest of the State of Maine as a whole, and I trust that the motion to indefinitely postpone Senate Amendment A does not prevail.

Mr. CLEAVES of Cumberland: Mr. President, there is not a man in this Senate whether he be doctor, lawyer or Indian chief but what is a business man. He has

got to be in order to be a success in his chosen profession or chosen business. So it doesn't need any particular effort in a business mind to know that in order to increase revenue in this state, in order to derive money necessary to improve roads and put in roads we are proud of, we must increase the business, and the only way to do it is to have reciprocity and have trucks coming in and going out of the State.

I have several things I want to say. I want to answer one thing said by one of our Senators. He said there were just a few at the hearing. For your information I would like to read the names of a few who were at the hearing:

Frank B. Marshall, Maine Automobile Association; Carroll B. Skillins, Pres. Maine State Chamber of Commerce; John Toft, Peacock Canning Co. of Portland and Lubec; Frank McKenzie, Maine Hotel Association; Carl Smith, Commissioner of Agriculture; Carroll Bean, Maine State Grange; Mort Havey, Associated Industries; Raymond Rideout, United Commercial Travelers; Russell Yelton, Mid-Central Fish Co. of Portland and Boothbay; Thomas Cummings, O'Hara Fish Co. of Portland and Rockland; Guy F. Dunton, Member of the committee of the Maine State Chamber of Commerce; Ted Atwood, Brown Company; Lincoln E. Clement, Clement Bros. Co., also member of Governor's Council; Raymond M. Conary, Pres. of the Truck Union, A. F. of L.; Sen. George B. Morrill, Burnham and Morrill Co.; James F. Rowan, Washington, D. C., member of the Executive Committee of the National Household Goods Carriers Association; L. E. Porter, formerly owner of the Atlantic Motor Express; Frank Davis, representing the oil industries; Warren Saunders, Saunders Brothers Dowel Mfgs.; Frank Doyle, potato grower of Caribou; Albert C. Brewer, Presque Isle; Sherwood W. Prout, Lubec.

That doesn't indicate to me a very small group. It indicates to me a very powerful group.

Before proceeding I want to take up one other thing that was stated, and I want to read an excerpt from a communication to me from one of the finest experts on trucking in the East. He says:

"There is another myth that has been circulated so long that the original circulators, the railroads, have begun to believe it themselves. This is the horrible damage trucks of over ten ton capacity do to the highways. 20,000 lb. gross trucks are very bad, but 40,000 lb. gross are ten times worse and anything over 40,000 lbs. gross will shatter the roads a hundred feet in advance of its arrival.

"Let's look at the record. How many places do any one of you know where one of our Federal Aid, or State Highways have been damaged by one of these semi-trailer freight units by its passage? How many places do you know of where a first class piece of road has been abandoned? What happened to it after a few years? Frost, moisture, heat, and cold, and even grass and shrubs are continually seeking to tear down what man has built.

"How many of your second class highways with proper drainage have you seen damaged by dual tired trucks? How many of you have seen wrecker trucks without chains back into a bad road and pull a pleasure car out that was hopelessly mired? Did not the truck press down the mud and help make a way for the car to roll out? The width of the tires on the truck was 40 inches and on the passenger car twelve or thirteen inches. This is the answer.

"Given a sufficient width of pneumatic tires, the tendency would be to make a road, not damage it. A one-horse vehicle with narrow wheels and steel tires in the olden days and today when used, will cause more damage to a country road in the spring than any other vehicle.

"You do not need experts to tell you whether or not these statements are so; you know they are so.

"Loose sand can be driven through, if you let out some of the air in your tires. This enables cars and trucks to cross deserts without trouble. The extra bearing surface and low pressure does the trick. The vehicle makes its own roads.

"What do the experts say is the effect of heavy loads on pavements? The late Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, made an exhaustive study, published in two volumes, in which he set forth his findings on the effect of weather and heavy loads on the highway.

"Thomas H. McDonald, U. S. Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. E. F. Kelly, Chief of Divisions and Tests of the same Commission, H. F. Winn and P. C. Rutledge of Engineering Experiment Station of Perdue University, Mr. F. Lavis, Consulting Engineer of New York, reporting to the Highway Research Board on Effect of Heavy Motor Vehicles on Highway Cost, Major Wm. G. Sloan, State Highway Engineer of New Jersey, Mr. J. F. Ellison, Chief Engineer of Dept. of Highways of Minnesota, Mr. T. A. Dicus, Chairman of Highway Commission of Indiana, and many other prominent Highway Engineers join in the decision that: "The ravages of Nature are Highway Engineers' No. 1 Problem." They agree that highways must be built to sufficient strength to carry passenger cars and take care of the forces of nature. That they do not require the impact percentage actually decreases as a wheel load increases. That larger balloon tires as now used, properly spaced do not injure the highway.

"The American Association of State Highways Officials, Western States Highway Officials Society of Automotive Engineers and U. S. Army have long and exhaustively studied this problem.

"A disinterested, exhaustive study over a period of years or the bald unsubstantiated statement of those who are only interested in elimination of all trucks on the highway. This is for you to consider.

"The primary use of large tractor-trailer units is only on the federal, state and state aid highways between sizeable communities. The practice is to use these trucks to transport the big bulk of freight to terminals and break up points. Anything going into the outlying districts over secondary highways is hauled with small trucks. In very few instances do the big trailers go off these first class roads.

"The tendency in the reconversion period will be for there to be less business especially in war goods. We must struggle to hold our own and replace with peace time goods the deficit in war material manufacture. That is what we are striving to do."

I have given considerable study but I am ashamed to say it is so technical I hardly dare speak on

it. However, I am absolutely sold on the proposition.

Before proceeding, Mr. President and Senators, I want to tell you how I happened to start my interest in this reciprocity bill. Just before the Senate convened in January I had a directive from the War Department for 5,000 feet—you know I am in the lumber business—of four-inch clear pine which was vitally needed in Boston two days from that time, to go on a ship going overseas. It was going on a special job and when you have a directive from Washington, it means just what it says. There are no delays and no excuses. You have to produce. It so happened I was the only one in New England that had this pine in this section that could be moved. I tried to get a truck. I tried to get several trucks. It was away from the beaten highway. The regular contract trucks would not even consider it. I tried about a dozen companies out of Boston to get them to do this in a hurry. I offered all prices. The answer was, No, that they could not afford it as they had to pay \$240 in New Hampshire and \$60 in Boston. The result was I had to go to various retail yards in the Massachusetts section and pick up a little here and there in order to fill this. It started me on the warpath and the more I studied this situation the more I was convinced we, in Maine, were up against a proposition that should rightfully be changed.

The trouble with us on this bill, gentlemen, is we talk about trucks coming into the state of Maine. We forget—and I want you to get this point and get it strong—it is not the trucks coming into Maine we are interested in in this bill, but the trucks that are going out. It is the trucks that go out from the lumbermen, the farmers, the fishermen and industries. We are opening up markets whereby these lumbermen and those industries can make money and the prosperity of this state is in direct proportion to the prosperity of the various businesses that make up the state. It is not argumentative. We know it to be so.

How would you feel if you were a truckman in Bangor, Portland or Lewiston, sitting in your office and saw some Massachusetts trucks go by and take business from your customers and truck their stock to

New York? They are doing something you are not privileged to do because you cannot afford to. They are extended reciprocity by all other states. They come to Maine and take your goods and then they take off the Maine license plate and put it behind the visor so other states won't know they have a Maine license, and they proceed to New York with your produce. It would kind of burn you up.

If you want to do it you have to pay \$240 in New Hampshire, \$60 in Massachusetts, \$100 in Rhode Island and \$200 in Connecticut just to get to New York—a total of \$600 per truck.

This bill is for the farmer. It is for the small business man as well as the truckman. I want to bring to your attention that the only thing that has been talked about this morning is the big truck. That is not even one percent. We have 4500 trucks in this state of ours, and only 300 are large trucks. We want them to move with produce out of the state to enhance our markets. I do not know as you realize it, but 56 percent of our Maine communities are dependent on trucks for the necessities of life.

I want to repeat that and repeat it emphatically. Fifty-six percent of our Maine communities are dependent on trucks for the necessities of life. 60 percent of Maine's livestock, milk and farm produce are hauled by trucks.

I want to bring up one thing where I know what I am talking about. I do not know all about lumber, but this particular thing I do know. In Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut there is a normal market for lumber. It is primarily an industrial market and these large industries are unable to buy their lumber for boxes and crating and various things of that nature in carload lots because they do not have the space to pile it up. They must resort to small truckload lots at frequent intervals. At the present time New Hampshire and Vermont are the recipients of that business. We can not have it because we cannot afford to pay the fees necessary, the registration, to get to that market. In other words, we are absolutely deprived of it with the exception of only a few trucks registered which you count on the fingers of one hand.

I also call to your attention that pulpwood, hardwood, and hardwood novelties constitute one of the big-



gest businesses, if not the biggest in the State of Maine. There is in those markets I have spoken about the opportunity to have that business and to have it on the palm of your hand if you just ask for it. Why is that? It is because our lumber in the State of Maine is superior to that of Vermont and New Hampshire—longer lengths, softness of texture, the nailing qualities are better. All we have to do is say, "Gentlemen, we want your orders". When I tell you it means millions of dollars of new revenue to the business interests of the State, I am not enlarging the facts one bit.

Take for example our fish business. I have learned a great deal about the fish business in the last few weeks. One large fish company which does business here told me his volume would be increased eight times over what it has been right along if we had reciprocity. Incidental to that I want to read to you an article cut out of the paper by our Sea and Shore Fisheries Commissioner:

"Reloading of fish and lobsters, caused by truck license laws in New England, is responsible for unnecessary waste and loss of time between producer and ultimate customer, Sea and Shore Fisheries Commissioner Arthur R. Greenleaf states in support of passage of the truck license reciprocity law, now before the Legislature.

"More than 75 percent of Maine's sea food products are transported by trucks of all sizes," Greenleaf states, "and it is vital that these motor carriers are free to move without license restriction to all markets of the Nation."

"Over 80 percent of Maine's fishing communities," he said, "depend on trucks for the transportation of their products to market but most trucks are unable to make through trips to the Boston and New York markets because of the heavy license fees necessary. This license restriction makes necessary the reloading at wayside points."

We can go into our blueberry and into our potato and into our dairy farms and we can talk here for hours on the opportunities that will be extended to them to increase their business.

I do want to take up one or two things that have been under discussion around the legislature for the last several weeks. I am doing

it now because I want you to know what the answers are to it. In the first place, we understood we were to lose a great deal of money if this reciprocity law went through. I want to talk about one thing I neglected to say when talking on lumber. It is this. I talked to a man last Saturday who is a heavy lumber operator. He has two trucks registered, one to go as far as Massachusetts and the other as far as Connecticut. He told me if this bill is passed the minute he can lay his hands on new trucks he will add six more to his fleet. Gentlemen, this means six more registrations and six more opportunities for revenue from the gas tax.

Now, gentlemen, we will take our little sister state of New Hampshire. They brought the matter up to the legislature two years ago and had a great deal the same controversies and misunderstandings and criticisms we have in our Maine legislature, but even in the face of a \$220,000 estimated loss, they passed the bill with a two-year clause. What resulted? At the end of the two-year period they had gained \$87,000 instead of showing a loss. We paid New Hampshire—and by "we" I mean the business men of Maine—\$57,000 last year to buy licenses in New Hampshire. Does it seem sensible, gentlemen?

I want to read to you, with your permission, a letter from George Myhaver, Chairman of the Motor Transportation Committee of the New Hampshire legislature, who fostered this bill:

State of New Hampshire  
House of Representatives  
Concord, N. H.  
Peterborough, N. H.,

March 19, 1945.

Senator R. E. Cleaves, Jr.  
State House  
Augusta, Maine  
Dear Senator Cleaves:

That you may have full information regarding our experience with reciprocity in New Hampshire, I will give you an outline of the history of this legislation.

For many years, truck owners of the State of New Hampshire had introduced in our legislature an act to provide for full reciprocity. We always reported this bill inexpedient to legislate until 1943.

1943 was my second experience as chairman of the Transportation Committee, which held hearings on

the reciprocity bill. I was aware at that time that the testimony against the bill seemed to be faulty. Therefore, I made a very thorough investigation and demanded figures from the motor vehicle commissioner, which I am enclosing herewith, of the loss of revenue that this department had told my committee about previously. With these figures, we attempted to analyze the situation and were unable to come to any conclusion, as without Maine and Canada we were supposed to decrease our revenue by \$220,000. We then obtained an estimate from the highway department, and they claimed the same thing; their statement is enclosed and you will note that in 1944 they estimated a 10% decrease in fees of motor vehicles in addition to the loss from House Bill No. 499 (the reciprocity act). My committee decided with me that we would enact this bill so that we would not lose our 1943 revenue. The test amounted to this:

The actual decrease in registration revenue was \$108,816.25; you will note that this is one-half of what the opponents had sworn we would lose. At the same time, the gasoline road toll increased \$196,741.37, which showed a net increase for the Motor Vehicle Department of \$87,925.12. This was contrary to statements against this bill.

At this session of the legislature, the reciprocity bill was again brought to us to act upon. We found that absolutely no one but the railroad opposed the bill. They no longer could oppose it on the grounds of financial loss but did oppose it from the standpoint of permitting common carriers to use our highways without paying registration, comparing this to themselves, that they had to build their own right of ways.

There was not one vote against this reciprocity bill in either the House or Senate Committees, or the House and Senate itself at this session. It was entirely unanimous consent.

The two statements of figures that have been enclosed to you should be of interest, as they give the loss of estimated revenue of all the states and the highway department's figures.

I should like to state here that the opponents to this bill in 1943 consisted chiefly of the Boston and Maine and Maine Central Railroads,

as well as our Motor Vehicle Department and the Highway Department, plus some truck operators.

In 1945, our Motor Vehicle Department and Highway Department were strong for the bill. It had been proven by this time that there was no loss in revenue. The only opponent in 1945 was the railroads.

We in the New Hampshire Legislature have taken a definite stand on railroad influence in our good state. It has openly been stated that they control the legislature. Let me tell you here that this is no longer true. The fact that we were able to prove that New Hampshire did benefit under reciprocity was sufficient reason to believe that the Railroad had nothing but a selfish, competitive motive in opposing this legislation.

New Hampshire does not want trade barriers between our good states of Maine and New Hampshire any more than we do between the other states along our borders. Proof of this is the enactment of permanent reciprocity at this session of the legislature.

I trust that the legislature in the good State of Maine will not permit the opposition of the railroad from enacting good legislation, which will be beneficial to your citizens as well as ours, as I believe that no group, large or small, should be a controlling factor in any legislature.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) George A. Myhaver

I want to stop a minute, Mr. President. I spoke about railroads and I want to say right now that we are very fortunate in the State of Maine in having the high calibre men, men of excellent ability, of the railroad lobby. I commend them and commend the railroad for the type of men they have here. We do not feel they are trying to interfere with legislation in any way. In this bill my heart solidly goes out in sympathy for I know as citizens of Maine, and having the best interests of Maine at heart, they are entirely in sympathy with the reciprocity bill but due to the position they are in they must use some influence to oppose it.

Now, what about Vermont? Vermont had the same proposition we have. But they found they had \$103,000 net profit for the year and I am going to read you some figures. In 1935 they established the

reciprocity law. Their revenue from motor vehicles before reciprocity was \$526,301. In 1936, the first year, they received \$562,949, making a total net revenue of \$35,000. In 1937, one year later it was \$630,699 or \$103,000 net profit to them.

Now, there has been some discussion as to the fact that this law went through Massachusetts trucks would come in here abounding and a lot of Maine trucks would register in Massachusetts.

Now I spoke to you a few minutes ago about your business sagacity, suppose I say, and you as business men—I leave it to your judgment. Would you take your truck from Maine and go to Boston to register in the face of the following three points: One; Compulsory insurance. You know and I know the cost of compulsory insurance in Massachusetts is almost prohibitive as far as we are concerned in Maine. The second is the income tax law in Massachusetts. The third and most important is this, you are running against your labor law. They have a 48 hour week as compared with our 54 hour week, whereby they pay overtime; but the most important point is for every worker they have to pay 12½ cents an hour over our minimum wage. If you take a pencil and paper and do a little figuring you will see if you take an average of a man and a half for one truck a year, you will find it has cost you approximately \$1200 over what it would cost here in Maine. So I don't fear any of our Maine men will go to Massachusetts to register their trucks.

I want to bring out that it has been said these large trucks would flood our roads. We have in the United States of America an Interstate Commerce Commission and before any truck can come to Maine it must have a permit from the Interstate Commerce Commission and I understand right now it is practically impossible for a new truck to get a license from the Interstate Commerce Commission to come to the State.

Now, they say we will lose \$91,000 revenue if this bill goes through, and the figures are taken from the Secretary of State's office. This is the record of all out of state truck registrations. If we break them down we find the bulk of them are registrations from out of state concerns like large oil companies and

other big interests who keep trucks within the state of Maine all the time. They would not be favored by reciprocity because any truck within the State six months out of the year is considered a resident and must pay the Maine registration fee.

I do not know how many of you realize it, but for every dollar registration fee we get \$1.10 of gasoline tax. Last year our registration fees totaled \$4,000,000 and the gas tax was \$4,400,000. You compare that with New Hampshire and Vermont whose registration fees are only half of ours, and we have proven they showed a profit, and it doesn't take any great degree of intelligence to show we are going to double or treble our figure. Our figures, which I have not broken down would show \$279,000 to the good. That would be coming to the State of Maine in new revenue in a two-year trial.

Before closing I want to bring to your attention once more that we are fighting for Maine. You and I were elected to the Senate to represent the best interests of Maine. The best interests must be the prosperity of the farmers, the lumbermen, the fishermen and the industries and anyone doing business. Please keep in mind Maine is at the upper end of this country—the dropping off line—and any truck coming to Maine must bring goods and material for our people, for our industry and farmers and lumbermen, etc.

“Regarding the 20,000 pound gross—as I said at the start, I felt it would be all right but in looking into it, I found it was not. The protests received were quite numerous. I have a telegram from Elmer Marsh, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles which I want to read:

I have obtained copy of Maine Legislative Document 1121 re reciprocity, and note limit of 20,000 pounds. This limited form of reciprocity would require weighing of practically all Maine trucks operating interstate commerce in Vermont, resulting in inconvenience and delay to Maine owners and expensive enforcement.

We would prefer to extend to Maine trucks reciprocity up to legal load limits of 30,000 pounds for two axle trucks and 40,000 pounds for three axle or combinations.

(Signed) ELMER MARSH,  
Commissioner of Motor Vehicles.”

Now, I have been talking also

with Virgil White, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles in New Hampshire and he takes exactly the same stand. You are asking this truck registration to be limited to 20,000 pounds, and we are asking to show you that in two years we can make money. But this is like tying a man's hands and feet and throwing him into the water and telling him to swim a hundred yard dash. It is hardly fair. If we are going to do this, let's do it in a business-like way.

Mr. WELCH of Aroostook: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I am not in a position to speak for Aroostook County by any means but I will say that I have been home over the week-end, every week-end except one since the legislature convened. I have had quite a lot of correspondence in regard to reciprocity and I have heard no objections when I was in my county nor through correspondence, to full reciprocity which is what this amendment calls for. I have here a letter from a very prominent grower in the county who is very heartily in favor of it; also a telegram from an organization which is shipping, or did last year, 1/6 of the potatoes raised in the state, and they are also in favor of full reciprocity.

I hope the motion to indefinitely postpone does not prevail.

Mr. McKUSICK of Piscataquis: Mr. President, as a member of the committee I feel I should explain my position on this bill. I am heartily in favor of the idea of reciprocity but I am exceedingly concerned in the matter of revenue and the matter of maintenance of our roads, and some of the figures quoted from New Hampshire are not very convincing to me for this reason. They claim an increase in revenue but as I understand it, it is total revenue from motor vehicles and it is not revenue from trucks. It hasn't been brought out clearly or to my satisfaction.

There are two facts we cannot get away from, and they are, we have a registration fee for 12-ton trucks of \$300 while Massachusetts has a registration fee of \$60. We have a four-cent gas tax in Maine and Massachusetts has a three-cent tax. You can buy gas in Massachusetts cheaper and it stands to reason that trucks coming from Massachusetts to Maine will fill their gas tanks, and we

are told they hold 100 gallons, which will bring them to Maine and back again and we will not derive revenue from the gas for those trucks. It stands to reason one of our trucks going to Boston would fill the gas tank on the way back. We felt we made some concession when we granted reciprocity up to six tons. Farm trucks are not 10 or 12 tons. I think six tons will take in most of them. For that reason I believe we would go the wrong way if we voted for reciprocity.

Mr. CLEAVES: Mr. President, I wish to say for the Senator's information, the figures were based entirely on trucks and not on pleasure cars. Also, for his information, may I go back again to a little business sagacity. If you were a truckman and coming to Maine and were tied down by a legal limit in weight and you had a large load, you would certainly not put on extra weight in gas when you could be carrying extra merchandise.

Mr. CROSS of Kennebec: Mr. President, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves. He did a beautiful job.

There is one point I wish you would consider on this amendment. The committee has offered a new draft, feeling it covered perhaps nine-tenths or even more of the provisions of the original bill. I have not heard anything that would change it in my mind. I cannot conceive of loads of blueberries being trucked out weighing over six tons. I doubt if they would haul a larger load. It narrows down to several things—principally lumber and possibly potatoes. If we grant reciprocity on what would cover most of the residents of the State—and the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves, said of about 43,000 trucks only one percent were heavy trucks—if we legislate for 99 percent of the people owning trucks, I think we have gone a long way to help the people in this state.

Believe me, the Committee on Motor Vehicles is concerned only with helping the people in this state and excluding trucks from out of the state—those detrimental to the highway system.

As to one or two things on our statute books which are of interest—we do grant reciprocity on agricultural trucks of any size. We

also grant limited reciprocity on refrigerated trucks hauling food. They pay \$5.00 for a permit. It is on page 19 of the Motor Vehicle law. I do not know that it is particularly workable, but it is there.

I hope you will consider in passing on this new draft, it would apply to 99 percent of the truck owners of the State.

Mr. LEAVITT of Cumberland: Mr. President, I did not mean to say anything on this bill but I have listened very carefully to the proponents of the motion of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, that the amendment be indefinitely postponed and it seems to me that their arguments are best illustrated by a cartoon that once impressed me very much. There was an elephant standing on the side of an abyss and someone said to him—it was a cartoon and in cartoons you can talk to elephants and make them understand—someone said to him, "You can make it in two jumps". It seems to me the people who are now offering reciprocity for 20,000 pounds realize reciprocity must come to the State of Maine. When we first came to the legislature they said there would be no reciprocity but found out most of the people here are in favor of it, so they are hoping to convince us that like the elephant we could take two jumps and ruin would not come even though there is nothing to land on in the middle.

If we are going to have reciprocity, let's have full reciprocity and let's have the elephant make it in one jump.

Mr. DUNBAR of Washington: Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I listened to the debate this morning and did not intend to say anything on this measure because I felt that the speakers who feel as I do have covered the ground fully and well, and it was only because of the Senator from Aroostook making a certain statement, and making it I believe, truthfully, that led me to feel I ought to say something in regard to his own county, because we have heard from Aroostook, at least from one source. That is a letter that I happen to have here that I feel speaks the real true picture that has been outlined by those that are opposed to full reciprocity.

It is addressed to Mr. S. E. Woodman, Highway Commission, Augusta, Maine and dated March 1st. I

do not know the gentleman who wrote it or the company he represents but I know the Senators from Aroostook do. It is the L. D. Bearce Company, Distributors of Petroleum Products in Caribou, Maine. Gentlemen, this is what Mr. Bearce says:

March 1, 1945.

Mr. S. E. Woodman  
Highway Commission  
Augusta, Maine

Dear Mr. Woodman:

In regard to the truck reciprocity bill, I do not see how they can call this a reciprocity bill because as I see it there is not any reciprocity to it. First, the greatest flow of traffic is from Massachusetts to Maine. Second, it is my understanding from the best authority I know that it costs \$60.00 to register a truck in Massachusetts and to register that same truck in Maine it would be \$300.00. How can a man in Maine compete with the man in Massachusetts when the Maine man has to pay \$300.00 for his license and the man in Massachusetts has to pay \$60.00 for a license which allows him to haul the same amount of tonnage. Third, the gasoline tax in Massachusetts is three cents a gallon and the gasoline tax in Maine is four cents a gallon. Again the man operating in Massachusetts can operate cheaper than one in Maine. Also there is a difference in the price of gasoline of .004 per gallon between Boston and Portland and of course this again would be to the advantage of the man in Massachusetts in that he could purchase his gasoline cheaper than the man in Maine.

Also the trucker would naturally purchase his tires in Massachusetts, he would garage his truck, I suppose, in Massachusetts, he would repair them in Massachusetts, his mechanics would live in Massachusetts, their families would live in Massachusetts, their doctors and grocers in Massachusetts, etc. As I see it, the grocery store and every line of endeavor would be affected in Maine to the advantage of the same lines of endeavor in the state of Massachusetts.

I do not see how this bill can be put through except to the detriment of the State of Maine. They would use our roads without paying gas tax or registrations and in time probably 90% of the truck registra-

tions would be made in the State of Massachusetts.

The only way I see we could have reciprocity which would be fair to the citizens of Maine would be to have the same price for registration, the same amount of gas tax, the same amount of excise tax, and this of course would greatly decrease the amount of revenue which the state is receiving now from the trucking industry.

This may seem funny to you to be coming from a man who runs trucks in the State of Maine but I think you will agree that in order for we Maine people to stay in business on a reciprocity basis with Massachusetts, they have got to have the same fundamental basis to work from and that could only be had through equalization of registration fees, gasoline tax, gasoline prices and the many other problems which enter into this picture.

I see no other way but what this is a selling of the State of Maine citizens into the hands of citizens of Massachusetts and other states south of us.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) L. D. BEARCE."

Senators, I think that letter speaks volumes and it does come from Aroostook County. I was interested in the able presentation of this matter by the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves. It shows that he has given considerable study to this matter.

I believe in full reciprocity and by that I mean full reciprocity, but Senators, this is not the time for it, with the situation confronting our Highway Department that is confronting us at the present moment.

I was interested in that New Hampshire tried it for two years. For heaven's sake why not let us try it for two years under the Cross or the committee amendment and see how that works out. If it does work out, perhaps we can take a larger bite two years from now. We will know then, but if you take this amendment there is going to be a loss of \$91,000 which figures the Senator gets from the Secretary of State's office and I believe they are correct. But I think there are other registration fees to be added to that where trucks have been registered in the towns and increase it \$5,000 or \$6,000 more. If I have been advised correctly, you

are going to have a loss of around \$95,000 to \$96,000 in registrations. Can we afford to do it?

Our Governor has said in his Inaugural Address that there are to be no new bond issues and that the only money that can be used as I understand it is from bonds that will be retired this year and as I understand, that figure would be around \$1,700,000.

As soon as this war is over, I believe there will be available to the State of Maine, money from the federal government that can be used by the Highway Department for the building of our state highways but we have got to have the money with which to match federal funds and I say that we are not in a position at this time to even give away \$96,000. I would suppose that reciprocity meant equality. Well, I would like to see a trade made just once by the State of Maine whereby Maine would at least come out fairly even with the other state, and I know from talking with a truckman who trucked lobsters in my county of Washington, when I talked with him Saturday night, he said, "If you put this law through it will be the worst thing that could happen to the State of Maine."

I know there are big trucks bought and purchased in Massachusetts and ready to go and you have not got the trucks in Maine to match them and you cannot beat them. In answer to the Senator from Knox (Senator Smith)—he is looking at me with a smile—as to how it would help the lobster industry in Washington county and the blueberry industry, the bill from the committee will take care of Washington County in those two regards. I think we ought to give it a try. I think we ought to take the committee amendment and try it for two years and see how it works before taking the full load.

As I understand it, with the committee bill, there would be a loss of revenue to the state of between twenty to twenty-five thousand dollars. On this other one there will be a loss of \$95,000 to \$96,000 but two years from now, if you take the full reciprocity, you will find then they will be back to introduce a bill to make it perpetual and an accompanying measure with it to put the Maine truck registration fee on the same basis as the Massachusetts fee and that is what you

will have to do to have reciprocity to make it fair, put the Maine registration fee on the same basis as the Massachusetts fee and then I say to you, if I have been correctly informed you will not lose \$95,000 but you will lose over \$600,000 and please bear that in mind when you are voting on this amendment.

In closing, just let me say that speaking of making a trade recalls to my mind of listening one night over the radio a few years ago to that well known humorist, Will Rogers, when he was speaking of a conference that we were going to have at that time between the countries and he touched on that subject. He said, "We are a great country; we are a unique country. History has shown we have never lost a war or won a conference." And you pass this bill, this amendment and Maine stands to lose and not win.

Mr. WELCH of Aroostook: Mr. President, I just cannot quite imagine, in reply to my able colleague from Washington County, Senator Dunbar, where all the garage owners, mechanics, truck drivers, truck owners, doctors and lawyers and what have you, are going when they move to Massachusetts. Now, the letter from the fellow from Caribou—it was very well delivered—I am not familiar with the incident but I am well acquainted with the gentleman who wrote it, Mr. Bearce. I can hardly estimate the amount of his business. He is a dealer in gas and oil there in Caribou. But I do know we have an industry there that last year amounted to around \$80,000,000 with an average of around fifty million in most of the years. When I spoke I probably should have said the people that I had contacted were all people or mostly all people connected with our industry in the county.

Mr. GOOD of Aroostook: Mr. President, like the good Senator from Washington, Senator Dunbar, I didn't intend to say anything on this bill, but if I can do half as good job as he did without any preparation, I will think I have done some job.

I want to answer a statement from the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes made when he said it was costing such an amount of money to plow roads. If this reciprocity bill passes it won't cost a nickel more to plow the roads be-

cause the roads are being plowed anyway. Our trunk lines are plowed anyway and they will be plowed hereafter.

Speaking about roads being torn to pieces by trucks, it is recognized in our section that small trucks, heavily loaded, like five ton trucks, are much harder on the road than big trucks because the big trucks have larger tires and cover a greater surface and therefore, we do not recognize them as being too damaging to the roads.

Now, with all due respect to the railroads, I don't know what we would have done in Aroostook if it had not been for railroads. The first year I was down here there was a similar bill came before the legislature and I was in favor of it and I think my good personal friend, Allie Cole, for whom I have the highest regard, was with me. Now I learn that Mr. Cole thinks it is wrong. He might be right. Knowing conditions as I do in our section of the country—previous to 1929 I think it was, with railroad rates being almost prohibitive we went to Washington, went to the Public Utilities Commission, went to everyone—every conceivable source, to get the railroad rates reduced. They reduced them some, but one day there was an old farmer back in the northern part of Aroostook who said, "I am going to truck my potatoes," and so he loaded up his potato truck with a load of potatoes and started down the line. The idea caught favor and before this war came about potatoes were going out of Aroostook County in streams by trucks. They didn't go to Massachusetts but they went to the coast to Winterport—thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of barrels, before the war came on and the gasoline situation and tire situation became bad so they could not do it.

I am predicting after this war if we have the reciprocity bill there will be trucks in Aroostook, not small trucks but large trailer trucks which will go to Boston and other sections of the country at night. They could be in Boston around ten or eleven o'clock the following day ready to deliver the produce. I believe I am right. So far as loss of revenue is concerned, I do not believe in the over-all picture we will lose any revenue.

This is of vital importance to us. Who likes to come to the Maine

border and find a barrier? This may not be true, but I think it is. When there was a car shortage and we could not get the seed out—I am not blaming the railroads because their refrigerated cars had to be de-iced—I understand there were two large trucks coming from Pennsylvania up here to get two loads of seed potatoes. When they got in Old Town, I think it was, I understand they were held up and they were held there for somewhere between a week and two weeks and it cost several hundred dollars before they could go on any farther. If that is reciprocity, gentlemen, I do not like it. If we have reciprocity they can come in here with a truck and load it up and take it out. The Cross bill isn't going to do the job. I think the amendment the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves, is offering will do the job.

I have no feeling against the railroads, understand. We need them but we are up there in that section of the State and we are living there. I speak perhaps selfishly for Aroostook County. I am from that section and will do my best to protect it. If I thought it would injure any part of the State—Aroostook County or any other part—I would oppose it. I think it will help us and I think the time is coming when a lot of potatoes will be transported out by truck.

I do not blame the men who represent the railroads. They have honorable men and they are intelligent men and they are doing the job they are paid to do. If I was a lawyer and could do that job, I would do it; but I am looking at it from my point of view and I think it is time we stood up and said what we feel is right. I hope the motion does not prevail.

Mr. NOYES of Hancock: Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senate if I gave the impression in my remarks that I thought that by full reciprocity the cost of snow removal would in any way be changed. What I did neglect to do was to give you a complete picture of the way our highway money is spent. \$1,200,000 is the amount set up for snow removal. You will also find the item \$3,900,000 for maintenance. Add the two together. You will also find approximately \$1,700,000 for debt retirement. Add that. You will also find close to one-half million for bonded indebtedness.

Add that. You will also find one-half million for state police. Add that. You will also find \$200,000 for administration costs. Now add those figures together and take the revenue of less than eight million dollars and see what you have for construction.

It was my point that I tried to make, that this increase in traffic would necessarily increase that maintenance and I still stand on that point regardless of what the big truck owner may say or anyone else. When those trucks go on the road, especially in the spring of the year—I have driven my car from here to Hancock County the last few weeks, I don't know how many weeks, but too long, and I want to say that I know that the heavy trucks won't do the roads any good.

Mr. BROWN of Aroostook: Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this matter because I realized there were people on both sides who had made a great study of it. I also hesitate in disagreeing with my colleagues in Aroostook County. I do not know why we disagree so much unless it is because we are individualists and each thinks along his own line.

I want to mention one difficulty we are in on highways — that is, we have over 1200 bridges in the State of Maine more than ten feet wide. We have thousands of culverts in the State of Maine, and whether or not a big truck weighing 10 or 20 tons does more damage to a road than a horse and buggy, I am not going to attempt to argue, but it certainly does more harm to culverts and bridges. There are 40 bridges listed with the Highway Department that must be rebuilt as soon as we can possibly rebuild them.

The Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, didn't give all the picture on highway funds. He didn't state we have at the present time a bonded debt of about \$26,000,000 and a great deal of it is drawing interest at the rate of four percent and some five percent.

Certainly if there is going to be any benefit from these big trucks it is simply going to be offset by the increased expense for road repair. The more trucks you run over the roads at high speed the more you damage the roads, regardless of what they say.



We are faced with the situation of maintaining roads with no money and I say in all sincerity, as I have stated,—and I have talked with the highway department,—it will be many years before we can put the roads back in the shape they were before the war. The only way is by bond issue or by raising the gas tax.

If you raise the tax and have reciprocity as has been said, it is not true reciprocity, and we will have more trucks load up in Massachusetts. I cannot conceive, as Senator Good suggested, and I have every respect for him — that Aroostook County is going to buy these trucks and haul potatoes to Massachusetts. There will, of course, be some but it will be a small part of the total crop that will be hauled from Aroostook County down over the highways. And by the way, Aroostook highways at the present time and in fact, never have been in condition to carry these heavy trucks. We have done it but we have dozens of culverts and bridges. We have narrow roads and crooked roads. They are insufficient for small trucks and passenger cars to meet those large trucks, especially in the winter time. If this trucking increases we have got to plow the roads wider and that is an increased cost.

I am in favor of a limited reciprocity bill. I believe it will help our situation but until such time as we can by some means provide revenue to save the roads we have and rebuild our culverts and bridges, I believe it would be well to go along with this amendment.

I believe ultimately we will truck a good deal out of Maine. I cannot believe we would truck from Aroostook as far as Portland if we had any other way. I think the only way to truck is to nearby seaports — Calais or Eastport where they have wharves, and they can move them from there.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, will prevail.

Mr. CROSS: 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 Hancock, Senator Noyes, that Senate Amendment "A" be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SMITH of Knox: Mr. President, there has been injected into

this argument the assertion that we are making a poor trade. It reminds me of the story of the man who came from Massachusetts to the State of Maine with a truck load of four horses. After he got through with our poor traders he had to thumb his way home with only a jack-knife and a suit of clothes in his possession.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Hancock, Senator Noyes, that Senate Amendment A be indefinitely postponed. Is the Senate ready for the question? A division of the Senate has been asked.

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

Mr. CLEAVES: Mr. President, I move that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment A.

Mr. NOYES: Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment A, and a division of the Senate has been asked. Is the Senate ready for the question?

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

Thereupon, Mr. Cross of Kennebec presented Senate Amendment B and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment B to bill, An Act Relating to Registration of Motor Vehicles, S. P. 423, L. D. 1121. Amend said bill by striking out all of Section 5 thereof and inserting in place thereof the following: 'Section 5. Limitations. The provisions of this act apply only to vehicles having a rated carrying capacity of six tons or less. The provisions of this act shall become effective on January 1, 1946 and shall remain in force until December 31, 1947 inclusive. It is the intent of the legislature to change the present statute until and including December 31, 1947 at which time the present statute shall return to full force and effect.'"

Mr. CLEAVES: Mr. President, I think I brought out in my talk in the first part of the session, all of the points that were brought out by the opposition. There is one point I did not bring and which I am afraid you don't understand, and that is that reciprocity must be

extended to us by other states as well as we extending reciprocity to them. If we have that six ton or 20,000 gross or what have you, we are not going to get full reciprocity from the other states, plus the fact that in the event they did, it would mean weighing trucks on both sides of the line, and it would cost thousands of dollars to weigh incoming trucks in Maine and would cost New Hampshire the same amount on outgoing trucks.

So, Mr. President, I move that this amendment be indefinitely postponed and I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT: The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Cumberland, Senator Cleaves that Senate Amendment B be indefinitely postponed, and that Senator has asked for a division.

A division of the Senate was had.

Sixteen having voted in the affirmative and fourteen opposed, the motion prevailed, Senate Amendment B was indefinitely postponed, and the bill was tomorrow assigned for second reading.

On motion by Mr. Brown of Aroostook

Recessed until two o'clock this afternoon.

#### After Recess

The Senate was called to order by the President.

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

On motion by Mr. Dunbar of Washington, the Senate voted to take from the table, bill, An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law as to Unemployment Compensation Fund (H. P. 1253) (L. D. 878) tabled by that Senator on April 10 pending passage to be engrossed.

That Senator then presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption:

"Senate Amendment A to bill, An Act Amending the Unemployment Compensation Law as to Unemployment Compensation Fund. (H. P. 1253) (L. D. 878). Amend said bill by adding at the end thereof the following underlined words 'provided however that on June 30 of each year, all moneys in excess of one thousand dollars in this fund

shall be transferred to the Unemployment Compensation Fund.'"

Senate Amendment A was adopted, and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Hopkins of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to Fees of Officers for Service for Delinquent Taxes. (H. P. 1421) (L. D. 1093) tabled by that Senator on April 5 pending passage to be engrossed.

Mr. HOPKINS of Kennebec: Mr. President, I tabled this matter because of the wording of the bill which seemed to indicate that there was something out of line which needed explanation. I yield to the Senator from Franklin, Senator Hall.

Mr. HALL of Franklin: Mr. President, in explanation of this bill, I will just say that this does not change as might show in the bill. I think it was in 1943 the legislature passed a law to give the sheriff the sum of one dollar, and twenty cents a mile travel one way to deliver these papers. This simply changes it so that if the constable delivers these papers he would get the same amount for his work as the sheriff. Before that the constable got twenty cents. The committee could not see why a constable who did the same work as the sheriff should not receive the same amount for the work.

Thereupon, the bill was passed to be engrossed in concurrence.

On motion by Mr. Owen of Kennebec, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act to Provide for the Making of a Survey of all Hospital and Health Center Facilities in the State (H. P. 844) (L. D. 508) tabled by that Senator on April 10 pending passage to be enacted, and on further motion by the same Senator, the bill was passed to be enacted.

On motion by Mr. Batchelder of York, the Senate voted to take from the table Bill, An Act Relating to Relief During the Emergency for Businesses in Financial Distress Because of Wartime Conditions (S. P. 422) (L. D. 1104) tabled by that Senator on April 10 pending con-

sideration; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed, House Amendment A was indefinitely postponed and that Senator presented Senate Amendment A and moved its adoption:—

“Senate Amendment A to bill, An Act Relating to Relief During the Emergency for Businesses in Financial Distress Because of Wartime Conditions, S. P. 422, L. D. 1104. Amend said bill by inserting in the 2nd line of Section One of said bill, after the word ‘mortgage’ the following:” and which are owned by members of the armed forces of the United States or which are owned by partnerships, corporations or fiduciaries more than fifty percent interest of which is owned by a member or members of the armed forces of the United States.”

Which amendment was adopted and the bill as so amended was passed to be engrossed in non-concurrence.

Sent down for concurrence.

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

On motion by Mr. Welch of Aroostook, the Senate voted to take from the table bill, An Act Relating to the Prevention of Forest Fires (H. P. 1106) (L. D. 552) tabled by that Senator on March 28, pending passage to be enacted; and on further motion by the same Senator, the Senate voted to reconsider its former action whereby the bill was passed to be engrossed.

Mr. WELCH of Aroostook: Mr. President, I now present Senate Amendment A and move its adoption. In presenting this amendment I would like to state that it is merely to take care of a duplication of authority. The present bill would give the authority to the Forest Commissioner to close the woods during the serious drouth. We already have that authority given to the Governor. I feel that it has been handled very satisfactorily under the present conditions and this would just be another case of giving to the head of a department more authority where I think it is well handled under the present situation.

The Secretary read Senate Amendment A:

“Senate Amendment A to bill, An Act Relating to the Prevention of Forest Fires (H. P. 1106) (L. D. 552). Amend said bill by striking out the underlined words ‘Forest Commissioner’ wherever they appear and inserting in place thereof, the underlined word ‘Governor’. “Further amend said bill by adding at the end of that part designated as Section 83A before the period, the following underlined words ‘except at public camp sites maintained by the Forestry Department.’”

Thereupon, on motion by Mr. Sterling of Somerset, the bill and accompanying papers were laid upon the table pending motion by the Senator from Aroostook, Senator Welch, that the Senate adopt Senate Amendment A.

On motion by Mr. Savage of Somerset

Adjourned until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock.