

Mr. BRIDWELL. Of course, not being familiar or as familiar with other Federal-aid programs as I am with the highway program, I do not believe I am qualified to answer the question. However, I think it is perfectly obvious that in order to receive Federal assistance for any kind of program, certain kinds of standards, certain kinds of conditions, criteria, have to be met. I see nothing particularly unusual in adding this particular criterion as a condition of receiving Federal aid.

Senator MUSKIE. But there are a number of programs that are not as popular in the States, or in all parts of the States, as highways. Highway construction is almost uniformly popular. There is a tremendous pressure on the State to meet this kind of condition. Recognizing this, the beautification program, for example, is keyed to this and it is pretty powerful medicine. But with respect to less accepted Federal programs, insistence upon a considerable condition could very well jeopardize the program in most of these States.

Mr. BRIDWELL. Well, I suppose that that is possible, Senator Muskie. you will recall that when the Highway Safety program was enacted by Congress, there was a similar provision written in—when I say similar, I mean similar to the beautification program—that provided the so-called penalty provision. And there was some discussion among the States of, well, is it worth it? In other words, would it be less expensive for us to ignore the highway safety program and just assume our 10-percent cut?

I do not expect any State, not one single State to adopt that attitude, for a real good reason, that in the wisdom of Congress, all of these programs are wise and are needed and I cannot believe that any State is going to take the position that it does not want any part of these programs simply because of the conditions imposed.

Senator MUSKIE. The Congress thought the defense highway system was so wise and so important that it provided that the Federal Government pick up 90 percent of the cost.

Senator Baker suggested that the word should be "costly", not "wise."

In other words, the Congress feels if the objective is important enough, in order to increase the objective, you increase the share of the Federal participation.

You indicated that the relocation problem is an important one. I believe there will certainly be delays to full implementation of the relocation program by all of the States. So it seems to us that it is better, considering the urgency of the problem, that we provide a larger percent of Federal money. Certainly it is not that much, as you indicated, in proportion to the total cost of the projects. The State highway commissioner of Maine tells me that although the division of the costs between the Federal Government and the State on the defense highway system was 90 to 10, as a practical matter, because there are many costs which were not subsidized, it is usually something less than 90 percent for the Federal Government, something more than 10 percent for the States. So we are talking about elements of cost that fall within that range, I think. If that is the case, I see no reason why we ought not to fund this. It is easily within the capability of funding. I think the net Federal share in my State would still not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the defense system. Is that an inaccurate analysis?