CHAPTER X
Border Warfare

The American Legislators' Association Aids in the Solution of Interstate Motor Vehicle Problems

THE INTERSTATE BUS AND TRUCK CONFERENCE

History

Border warfare between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey was responsible for the first motor vehicle conference which was held at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, October 20-21, 1933. Pennsylvania had passed a law requiring that foreign commercial carriers operating for hire on regular schedules take out Pennsylvania licenses when using Pennsylvania roads. To this law, New Jersey countered by requiring Pennsylvania cars going into New Jersey to carry New Jersey license plates; the result was chaos on the border line. In order to end this chaos, on February 27, 1933, Mr. Frederick C. Peters, Chairman of the Highway committee of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania introduced a resolution calling for a conference of the 17 northeastern states. The resolution also provided, "that the American Legislators' Association be requested by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to call this regional conference."

Copy of Resolution

The General Assembly of Pennsylvania: Resolution No. 34, Mr. Peters, in place,

WHEREAS, Various bills have been introduced seeking to regulate further the transportation of passengers and freight by motor vehicles, and

WHEREAS, The correct and equitable solution of this important question cannot be solved by the lone action of one state without detriment to its own citizens through the breaking down of reciprocal relations between states; therefore be it

Resolved, (if the Senate concur) That the American Legislators' Association be requested by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to call a regional conference of representatives of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and the District of Columbia with the view of framing reciprocal and uniform legislation and regulations relating to the size, weights, heights and lengths of motor vehicles for the transportation of passengers and freight which shall be permitted in the interests of the public safety and to make recommendations to the legislatures of said several states for the adoption of such legislation at a uniform date.

Resolved, That if such conference be called the delegates thereto from the State of Pennsylvania shall be the Secretary of Highways, Speaker of the House, the Chairmen of the House and Senate standing Committees on Highways, President of the Senate, two Senators to be appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and two Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the American Legislators' Association and to the Secretary of Highways by the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, February 28, 1933.

Agreed to by the Senate, May 2, 1933.

Position of the "Association"

The Association has no more predispositions with regard to the motor vehicle law
than it has on labor laws or banking legislation. On the other hand, one of the objects to which the Association is dedicated is the harmonizing of the activities and legislation of the various states. For that reason the Association undertook the organization of the conference.

The Project

The conference convened in the hope of agreeing upon a uniform code, specifying how large and how heavy motor vehicles may be. It also wished to perfect some permanent arrangement which would not only promote the adoption of the code, but also would facilitate its revision from time to time in case further study and experience indicate that it should be revised, or in case changed conditions call for changed specifications.

The following are the variations in viewpoint which made it difficult to agree upon a code.

1) Private motorists, whose passenger cars constitute the majority of traffic, usually object to all large buses and trucks.

2) Automotive manufacturers are not, in general, anxious for the authorization of exceptionally large units, because the market for them is more limited.

3) Bus and truck operators, whether operating as adjuncts to manufacturing and merchandising businesses or exclusively engaged in transportation as such, are the principal advocates of large automotive units, because the use of such units lowers the passenger-mile and the ton-mile cost.

4) Railroads find their revenues decreased by bus and truck competition, and therefore some of them are adversely affected by the use of large bus and truck units.

A Few of the Conflicts

There are innumerable conflicts in the width, height, length, and weight regulations in the various states. Here are a few samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Height (feet &amp; inches)</th>
<th>Width (inches)</th>
<th>Over-all Length for Combination of Vehicles (feet)</th>
<th>Gross Weight (tons)</th>
<th>Tractor and Semi-trailers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Wheel Truck</td>
<td>6-Wheel Truck</td>
<td>Tractor and Semi-trailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15½</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13½/3</td>
<td>18½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>106½</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18½</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>14-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17½</td>
<td>17½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Col.</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>106½</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15-2/3</td>
<td>19-3/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table conforms with legislative enactments until 1934.

1 For vehicles with dual pneumatic tires, other vehicles 8 feet.
2 To help change over from solid to pneumatic tires.

* Gross weight computed on basis of maximum legal axle weight plus 50% thereof for front axle weight.
1 Plus 750 lbs. per each foot and fraction thereof from center of front to center of rear axle.
2 On state-aid highways; on other roads 8 tons.
5) Highway officials as a class oppose exceptionally large buses and trucks, because it costs more to construct and maintain highways and bridges to accommodate them, and also because of the increased hazards.

Various Interests Represented

The Association did not originally intend to invite representatives of the various interests but as the plans progressed many special groups urgently pressed their desire to be heard. The Association finally came to the conclusion that the situation was identical with that of a legislative committee before which interested parties may make pertinent statements. Accordingly, the first part of the program was turned over to spokesmen of the interests involved while the last part was given to the chairman of the state delegations.

Views Presented

1. PIERRE SCHON, Transportation Engineer. General Motors Truck Company. “Existing Physical Regulations.”


5. GEORGE E. CLINTON, Chairman Rates and Transportation Committee, International Association of Milk Dealers. “Special Problems of the Milk Industry.”


11. JOHN S. WORLEY, Professor of Transportation, University of Michigan. “Automotive Vehicle Fees and Taxes.”

12. JOSEPH B. EASTMAN, Federal Coordinator of Transportation. “Regulation and Coordination of Transportation.”

The delegation chairmen of the several states then voiced suggestions as to what machinery would bring about and maintain uniform action of the states. They also gave their views on desirable regulations for the length and weight of buses and trucks.

Roster of Delegates

Presiding Officers

WILLIAM B. BELKNAP, Kentucky.
HENRY W. TOLL, Colorado.

Secretary of the Conference

JOHN H. FERTIG, Pennsylvania.

Parliamentarian

S. EDWARD MOORE, Pennsylvania.

Connecticut

MICHAEL A. CONNÉR, Motor Vehicle Department.
H. B. PINNEY, for the Governor.
R. W. STEVENS, for the Governor.

Delaware

JOHN W. BURRIS, Representative.
E. B. GRIFFENBERG, Senator.
W. W. MACK, Highway Department.
DONALD R. MORTON, for the Governor.
W. JENNINGS POORE, Representative.
W. A. SIMONTON, Senator.

Illinois

JAMES R. CLARK, Commerce Commission.
HOWARD C. KNOTTS, Commerce Commission.

Indiana

EARL CRAWFORD, Representative.

Iowa

LEW E. WALLACE, Motor Vehicle Department.

Maine

HERBERT W. KITCHEN, Senator.
ROBINSON C. TOBEY, Secretary of State.
Maryland

THOMAS D. ALENSANDRO, JR., Representative.
C. C. A. ANDERSEN, for the Governor.
J. ALLAN COAD, Senator.
A. H. ETZLER, Representative.
EMANUEL GORFINE, Representative.
T. BARTON HARRINGTON, Representative.
ADRIAN HUGHES, Representative.
HERBERT LEARY, for the Governor.
DAVID G. McINTOSH, JR., Senator.
KENT R. MULLIKIN, Representative.
ROBERT M. REINDOLLAR, Highway Department.
D. G. ROE, Senator.
D. MARSHALL SCHROEDER, for the Governor.

Massachusetts

NEWLAND H. HOLMES, for the Governor.
DANIEL J. HONAN, Representative.

Michigan

GEORGE F. ALGER, for the Governor.
O RVILLE E. ATWOOD, Motor Vehicle Department.
H. EARL MCNITT, Representative.
CLAUDE Root, Senator.
MURRAY D. VAN WAGONER, State Highway Commissioner.

New Hampshire

GEORGE H. DUNCAN, Representative.
JOHN F. GRIFFIN, Motor Vehicle Commission.
HAROLD H. HART, Representative.

New Jersey

HAROLD G. HOFFMAN, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles.
R. EARLE LEONARD, Motor Vehicle Department.
JAMES J. SHANLEY, Motor Vehicle Department.

New York

HERBERT BARTHELEMEW, Assemblyman.
JOHN L. BUCKLEY, Senator.
ROBERT A. CATCHPOLE, Assemblyman.
CHARLES A. HARRETT, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles.
JOHN W. KEESHAN, Assemblyman.
C. E. MEALEY, Department of Taxation and Finance.
FRANK T. QUINN, Assemblyman.

Herbert A. Rapp, Assemblyman.
OGDEN J. ROSS, Senator.
RICHARD L. SAUNDERS, Assemblyman.
E. W. WENDELL, Department of Public Works.
WALTER W. WESTALL, Senator.

Ohio

GLEN M. DAILY, Registrar of Motor Vehicles.
B. R. DONOVAN, Senator.
JAMES M. MATTHEW, JR., Senator.
G. E. NISWONGER, Representative.
R. A. POLLOCK, Representative.
J. EUGENE ROBERTS, Senator.

Pennsylvania

D. W. BECHTEL, Representative.
HARRY H. BRENNAN, Representative.
WILLIAM C. HUNSICKER, Senator.
A. J. WHITE HUTTON, Representative.
W. W. MATTHEWS, Motor Vehicle Department.
FREDERICK C. PETERS, Representative.
WILLIAM A. REITER, Motor Vehicle Department.
WILLIAM P. ROAH, Representative.
H. RICHARD STICKEL, Motor Vehicle Department.
GROVER C. TALBOT, Representative.
ELLWOOD J. TURNER, Representative.
THOMAS WEIDEMANN, Representative.
JOSEPH R. ZIESENHEIM, Senator.

Rhode Island

JAMES H. KIERNAN, Representative.
GEORGE R. WELLINGTON, Board of Public Roads.

Virginia

JOHN W. RUST, Senator.
WALTER H. SCOTT, Delegate.

West Virginia

WILLIAM S. DOWNS, for the Governor.
H. P. HENSHAW, Senator.
A. L. HELMICK, Senator.
RUSH D. HOLT, Delegate.
J. KAY THOMAS, Delegate.
JAMES P. TIERNEY, Delegate.

Resolutions

After two days of discussion, the Conference adopted the following resolutions:
WHEREAS, The Interstate Bus and Truck Conference has accomplished much in that it has shown the participating states the value of an opportunity to counsel together in a spirit of cooperation; Now therefore be it

RESOLVED, (1) That this body extend its thanks to His Excellency, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Legislature, and the other Pennsylvania officials who made this Conference possible.

(2) That this body express its appreciation to all of the states who cooperated by sending delegates.

(3) That this body express its sincere thanks to many of the delegates to this Conference who came at great personal sacrifice.

(4) That this body extend its thanks to the officers and the staff of the American Legislators’ Association for their efficient and unfailing assistance in organizing this Conference.

(5) That this Conference commend the idea of ‘interstate conferences such as this one, since much lasting good can be accomplished by calling states together in conferences on matters which are of general interest to all states.

WHEREAS, There is great variance of opinion among those using or interested in the use of the public highways for commercial purposes as to what are proper weights and dimensions of motor vehicles propelled thereon; and

WHEREAS, This variance is particularly noticeable in the conflicting claims of commercial motor vehicle operators and other common carrier agencies; and

WHEREAS, It would appear that the interest of taxpayers and private non-commercial motorists are not receiving the consideration that they should; Now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the interests of taxpayers and private non-commercial motorists must be recognized as paramount in determining the dimensions and weight of motor vehicles and the length of permissible combinations thereof;

That the public interest requires the adoption of specific maximum gross weights for each class of highway vehicles consistent with the preservation and safe use of the highways for private non-commercial motorists and consistent with a fair distribution of the expense of construction and maintenance of such highways;

That the public welfare and safety require the continuance of maximum gross weights for each class of vehicle and combination of vehicles, and within such maximum gross weights, such axle load and wheel load limitations as the protection of bridges and highways demand; and

That it is the sense of this Conference that there is a tendency toward a reduction of lengths and weights rather than an increase.

WHEREAS, It appears that sentiment and research have not sufficiently developed to enable this Conference to make recommendations governing the dimensions of trucks and buses throughout the area covered by this Conference;

THEREFORE, Be it recommended to the various state legislatures that arrangements be made for properly constituted and authorized delegates to be appointed to conferences of smaller groups of states under the direction of the American Legislators’ Association.

THE WESTERN MOTOR VEHICLE CONFERENCE

History

This conference, like the Interstate Bus and Truck Conference which met at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, October 20, 21, 1933, was called by one of the state legislatures. During a special session two years ago, the Utah legislature adopted a resolution calling a regional conference of eleven western states and requesting the American Legislators’ Association to organize it.

Resolutions

The Legislature of the State of Utah

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. By Senator Julian M. Bamberger. As signed by Governor Henry H. Blood, July 22, 1933.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:

WHEREAS, a lack of uniformity exists in the motor-vehicle laws and regulations of the various states; and

WHEREAS, this important question can
not be properly solved by the action of one
state alone;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the American Legislators'
Association be requested by the Legislature of the State of Utah to call a regional
conference, preferably at Salt Lake City, of the representatives of the states of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with a view to framing reciprocal and uniform legislation and regulations relating to
the licensing of motor vehicles, traffic regulations, regulations as to size, weights,
heights, and lengths of motor vehicles, and regulation and control of motor vehicles
engaged in transporting passengers and freight for hire, and to make recommendations
to the legislators of said several states for the adoption of such legislation at a
uniform date.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if such a conference is called the delegation
from the State of Utah shall consist of:

- a member of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate,
- a member of the House to be appointed by the Speaker of the House,
- three members to be appointed by the Governor.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by
the Secretary of State to the American Legislators' Association, and to the Governors of the States above mentioned with the request that said Governors submit it for action by the Legislatures of their States.

Resolutions endorsing the calling of this conference were also adopted by several of the state legislatures in that region. A resolution of endorsement was passed by the Western Conference of Governors at its meeting in Boise, Idaho, November 28, 1933.

Delegates

Official delegates were appointed by the eleven western states as follows:

- **Arizona**
  - NELLIE T. BUSH, Representative
  - THOMAS COLLINS, Senator
  - JOHN CUMMARD
  - E. T. HOUSTON, Senator
  - J. R. MACDOUGALL
  - E. M. WHITWORTH

- **California**
  - RUSSEL BEVANS
  - T. H. DENNIS
  - WILLIAM E. HARPER, Senator
  - L. I. HEWES
  - WILLIAM B. HORNBLOWER, Representative

- **Colorado**
  - GEORGE T. BRADLEY
  - JOHN E. FURLONG
  - C. H. GUNN
  - VERN S. HILL, Senator
  - HARVEY H. HOUSTON, Senator
  - DAVE JOHNSTON, Representative
  - EDWARD E. WHEELER

- **Dist. of Columbia**
  - H. K. KELLY

- **Hawaii**
  - WILL BORTHWICK, Representative

- **Idaho**
  - J. A. CHAMBERLAIN
  - M. REESE HATTABAUGH
  - HARRY HOLDEN
  - WILLIAM HYNES, Representative
  - THOMAS L. MARTIN
  - G. E. MCKELVEY
  - EMMITT PFOS
  - CHARLES A. ROOT
  - E. A. TAYLOR
  - FRANK E. WOODWARD, Senator

- **Montana**
  - L. J. CROONENBERGS
  - T. P. DANIELSEN, Senator
  - W. C. HUSBAND, Senator
  - A. J. PLUMER, Senator
  - R. D. RADER
  - FRANCIS A. SILVER
  - S. C. SMALL
  - HARRY SPARLING, Representative

- **Nevada**
  - W. M. DAVID
  - M. C. HAMLIN, Representative
A total of eighty delegates were passed by the committee on credentials. Each state was allowed but two votes: one administrative and one legislative, thus giving each state equal representation at the conference.
counsel of two representatives of the United States Bureau of Public Roads—Dr. L. I. Hewes, regional director with headquarters in San Francisco, and H. H. Kelly of Washington, D. C. On questions relating to carrying capacity of highways and bridges, and limitations on weight of motor vehicles, these gentlemen proved exceedingly helpful to the delegates in working out a formula which will prevent overloading and damage by trucks and buses to the federal aid highways in the western states.

Traffic Supervision

The sentiment of the delegates clearly indicated that the safety and convenience of the private automobile operator is of paramount importance, and that every effort must be made to reduce the growing number of automobile accidents and deaths on the highways.

The various states were urged to provide for better traffic supervision and policing within their borders. It was also urged that immediate provision be made for the adoption of safety legislation by the different states. If this is not done, the federal government may be compelled to intervene and promulgate regulations which would be imposed by officers far removed from the western states—a possibility which was vigorously opposed. In this connection, the opinion was freely discussed among the delegates that the Bureau of Public Roads and the various western legislatures could adequately meet the issues relating to highway construction, transportation, and safety without the intervention of any other specialized federal bureau. The various states seem to have the fullest confidence in the policies pursued by Thomas H. MacDonald, Director of the Bureau of Public Roads.

The resolutions which were adopted included recommendations for: a limit on the weights and dimensions of trucks, busses, and trailers; uniform regulations and licensing of automobiles; reciprocity as between states; and a uniform flat rate for licenses of private passenger cars as soon as economic conditions in the various states become more nearly equal. It was also proposed that the states which collect compensation for use of the highways by interstate commercial vehicles, in the form of a ten-mile tax, establish checking stations at the principal points of entry to collect the tax and to enforce the law with regard to reports on the contents of trucks, on insurance, and on proof of payment of state gasoline taxes.

Opposition was expressed to the diversion of motor vehicle registration fees, license fees, gasoline tax, or other special taxes on motor vehicle owners and operators to any purpose other than the construction, improvement, maintenance, or support of highways.

The committee on taxation also proposed that the federal government allot $500,000 for the construction and operation of an experimental and test road project in the western states. The resolution urged that the engineering features of such project and its operation be delegated jointly to the United States Bureau of Public Roads, the Western Association of Highway Officials, and the Highway Research Board.

"The purpose of the project would be to determine facts and principles affecting highway types, taxation, regulation, and administration. The resolution was unanimously adopted.

A Special Problem

At the outset of the afternoon session, William B. Hornblower, California Assemblyman, submitted a statement on behalf of his state explaining that the delegation would not participate in the voting on resolutions. He explained that California’s problems were much different from those in the other western states, but he stated that the delegation would present the recommendations of the conference to the California legislature for consideration, just as the other delegations will do in their respective states.

The first resolution, submitted by the committee on registration and licensing, was passed without comment. It urged that all certificates of title, all registration certificates, and all registration plates be controlled by a central department in each state; that a state highway patrol be created in each state to bring about enforcement and observance of motor vehicle laws; that upon the transfer of registration, the plates issued at the time of the original registration follow the car; and that every appli-
cant for a registration of or title to a vehicle not previously registered under the laws of the state be required to disclose its exact location.

Length and Width

A minority report was submitted by Arizona and New Mexico delegations objecting to weight-fixing proposals of the committee on weights and dimensions. During the discussion of the minority report, Mrs. Bush declared that highways in southern Arizona showed definite evidences of damage from heavy trucking from California, and that Arizona was not financially able to build highways up to the specifications of California, and that the weight problem should be left to the determination of the individual states.

The majority resolution which was adopted, however, without change provided: That the over-all length of single vehicles may not exceed 35 feet and that the over-all length of combinations of vehicles shall not be less than 45 feet nor more than 60 feet;

Combination Vehicles

That no combination shall consist of more than two units;

That no vehicle shall exceed a height of 12½ feet;

And that the width shall not exceed eight feet, with a few exceptions such as fire apparatus and road machinery;

That service brakes on all vehicles shall be adequate to stop within a distance of 40 feet when traveling 20 miles per hour on dry asphalt or concrete;

That wheel and axle loads shall be fixed as follows: 8000 pounds when wheel is equipped with high-pressure pneumatic, solid rubber, or cushion tire; 9000 pounds when wheel is equipped with low-pressure pneumatic tire; gross weight on any wheel, 18,000 pounds if equipped with low-pressure pneumatic tire, and 16,000 pounds if equipped with any other type of tire;

Gross Weights

That the gross load on two-axle vehicles be limited to 24,000 pounds and the gross

RELOADING

A scene laid near Evansville, Indiana, December, 1932; crates of Christmas turkeys laid on the Kentucky line; and blame laid on the conflicting motor vehicle laws.
load on three-axle vehicles be limited to 34,000 pounds. The resolution also proposed that the formula of the American Association of State Highway Officials governing gross weight be adopted.

The committee on reciprocity, regulation, and uniform code admitted at the outset that “the diversity and multiplicity of laws governing transportation of persons and property for ‘hire’ made reciprocity at this time difficult,” but urged that the legislatures consider uniformity for the protection of the public.

It proposed uniform regulation of working conditions, hours of service, insurance, and other measures so that a maximum of safety and security to the public may be assured.

The resolution urged that the executive committee of the conference work with officials of the states toward a more uniform system of laws governing bus and truck traffic.

Harry C. Huse, Director of Licenses in the State of Washington, as chairman explained that his committee realized the difficulties in the way of reciprocity but expressed the hope that the resolution would result in some legislative action which would be beneficial to the states.

Taxation

The committee on taxation and highway costs submitted a resolution which was adopted without discussion. It proposed that the total amount of taxes to be imposed upon motor vehicles and their use should be determined by the economic requirements of the annual highway budget and should take into account the following costs: administration, maintenance, interest on highway debts, replacement charges, and improvement of existing highways.

The same committee also proposed that for the sake of uniformity, the conference recommend to the various legislatures the passage of a flat license rate for passenger cars at some future date and that vehicles using untaxed fuels be charged higher license fees to equalize the tax burden between such vehicles and those using taxed fuels.

Adjournment

The Western Bus and Truck Conference adjourned June 27 after making a significant advance in the cause of uniform motor vehicle regulation. Through the adoption of a set of resolutions, which are to be offered for ratification to the various legislatures, the Conference took an initial step in the unification of our forty-nine motor vehicle codes. These resolutions can now serve as a model for other sections of the country desiring to solve their motor vehicle problems by similar interstate cooperation.

The work of the American Legislators’ Association in this conference is summed up by the New Mexico Tax Bulletin, “The American Legislators’ Association is an agency which offers unlimited potentialities for the solution of many problems through the organization of conferences among states.”

A CHECKING-UP PARTY AT THE STATE LINE.