are begun, we start sniping at desirable standards to cut the cost estimates. Right-of-way is costly, so we buy less than we should have and try to get alon cramping the cross-section design.

Out in the country the location plans show an isolated sharp curve, an what do we do? Well, we decide it is not feasible to do anything, and the curve is built, a sure accident trap for the inattentive driver. Shoulders tha ought to be eight or ten feet wide, we design for six feet to save a little dirt an money. This straying away from design standards is what we call being prac tical and against this whittling of initial expenditures, we are deliberatel gambling with the safety of the next generation at least. We need to appl more of what we already know about safety and design. People ought to b worth more than the pavement.

I will say that engineer was Mr. C. W. Prisk.

There is a philosophy here. There is a thinking that many time we have an opportunity when we are building new projects to do a fine job. We may not come back to it for a while. And I think that i what is striking on the committee, as we progress with this phase o the hearing.

Perhaps we could do this, beginning at the left with Mr. Morton each chairman of a particular AASHO committee might relate to th subcommittee here how your particular committee fits into this overall picture and what your observations might be as to what we can d about the fixed object roadside hazard problem that is facing us. Mr. Morton?

Mr. MORTON. I think from a traffic viewpoint, probably one of ou difficulties in any organization is the difficulty of communication. Surely at our traffic committee meetings we try to draw from the traffic engineers of the respective States the hazards they are encountering and the methods they are employing to overcome them.

I feel that we have made substantial progress in recent years of moving back the signposts. We have pretty well accepted now the theory of using the breakaway sign or the sign with the signposts with a weakness created in them so they are not a fixed object.

Mr. W. MAY. You mentioned the breakaway signs, which seem to have such considerable merit. But in the nine new projects that were analyzed, only one State used breakaway supports on the project, and then only partially. Only one out of the nine.

Mr. CLEVELAND. May I inquire at this point?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Can you have any breakaway sign that supports a sign that goes across the highway? A breakaway sign by its nature has got to break away; and if you have a situation where you have to have a sign all the way across the highway, it cannot be a breakaway sign. Am I correct or false on that statement?

Mr. A. E. JOHNSON. You are right.

Mr. W. MAY. That may be true right as of this minute; but it is difficult for at least the staff to consider that we cannot develop a breakaway overhead bridge sign. Texas A. & M. is about to work on it. They have ideas about two supports to the side located in such a way that you could not strike both supports at the same time. If you broke away one, one could still hold up a sign.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is that feasible from an engineering standpoint to have a sign where the impact of a car could break away one of the supports and the other support would be strong enough to hold it?

Mr. E. M. JOHNSON. It would have to be so designed to do that. As Mr. May says, I certainly would not say that is an impossibility, but