

tures. It would beef up the contractual obligations so that each State could depend on that, and they would take away the uncertainty and allow the States to proceed on a uniform highway program.

Section 104 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

(f) No part of any sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure upon any Federal-aid system which has been apportioned pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be impounded or withheld from obligation, for purposes and projects as provided in this title, by any officer or employee of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal government, except such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, as being necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the highway trust fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund.

We would like to call attention, Mr. Chairman, of the committee to the fact that the cutbacks, as they have been made, have left no warning to the highway departments, and by mixing the fiscal year versus calendar year, it has caused an undue hardship to many States, and it has especially in my State of Wyoming, and that is somewhat dear to my heart at the present time. So we think that we should, if there is to be a cutback, it should be by congressional action, and some advance notice, so that we can prepare for it.

While we have no particular pride in authorship, or the language used, we believe something along this line might be considered by your committee.

We realize that legislation to accomplish similar purposes has already been introduced. Anything that would do the job is acceptable to us.

It is our experience that a cutback in the highway program in most or all of the States has such an adverse impact on the local economy, and on the contracting industry, that it makes the overall beneficial effects of such cutbacks questionable, especially when one views the magnitude of our vast and growing highway needs that are getting ahead of our efforts.

We feel that any time that the national interest should dictate a reduction in the highway program, that it should be carefully thought out and should probably be accomplished by a reduction in congressional authorizations, and made known in sufficient time that all those affected by it can adjust without experiencing a psychological shock.

At the time that AASHO comes to you, in the near future with its After 75 program recommendations, we will be supporting that program with results of a nationwide research survey, entitled "Public Preference for Future Individual Transportation."

This research effort, which is unique in its field, used twice the number of interviews generally used by the Gallup, Harris, or similar public opinion polls.

The project was carried on through the Highway Research Board, and the results definitely bear out the fact that the highway program, and the use of the automobile, continues to be a very popular thing with the public, a situation which will grow. Your committee can plan the continuation of the highway program and its future with complete assurance that the public supports you.

We initiated this research project at a time when we heard a great deal about developing a national transportation policy, system, and