

Mr. MILLER. We cannot possibly do so.

Mr. CRAMER. There is an uncertain condition after the bid.

Mr. MILLER. Experience to date, most uncertain, yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that although I understand the other body is going to take this matter up, that if it is not taken up adequately, that consideration be given to taking this matter up before this subcommittee.

I would like to also welcome before the committee, rather belatedly, Mr. Turnbull, director of Florida Road Building Association, and I appreciate his advising us of the effect of this cutback, as it relates to the State of Florida.

And we put some evidence in the record yesterday which indicates that the cutback was rather severely affecting the road building industry in the State of Florida. That is the effect of your testimony, is it not?

Mr. TURNBULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. I also understand that there is some question as to what should happen relating to the Interstate System after 1972.

Before I get into that, I will say, Mr. Turnbull, as you know, I have very strongly opposed the cutback as not being anti-inflationary, but inflationary feeding, as it relates to the industry, but relating to the Interstate System.

Now, Mr. Turnbull, I would like to ask you, because you are familiar with it, do you know of the necessity of providing adequate facilities between Tampa, St. Pete and Miami?

Mr. TURNBULL. Right. That area is one-quarter of the State of Florida, including Sarasota, Fort Myers—

Mr. CRAMER. Southeast coast; right?

Mr. TURNBULL. That is not serviced by an Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. If my memory serves me right, and I can be wrong, you were involved with the State roads department at the time that the 1956 act was under consideration and State recommendations were submitted, were you not?

Mr. TURNBULL. Right.

Mr. CRAMER. And Tampa, St. Pete, to Miami, what I termed was the missing link, was included in the interstate mileage at that time, was it not?

Mr. TURNBULL. It was, yes.

Mr. CRAMER. It was turned down, as I understand it, at that time, because of lack of adequate traffic to justify it?

Mr. TURNBULL. The traffic volume did not warrant it at that time.

Mr. CRAMER. As you indicate, two of the major metropolitan areas in the United States, let alone in the State of Florida, are the middle west coast, Tampa, St. Pete, and Clearwater and Miami, that have no interstate connecting link; is that not correct?

Mr. TURNBULL. That is correct. One of the primary highways of Florida in the early days was the Tamiami Trail, which paralleled the proposed Interstate System.

Mr. CRAMER. What is interesting to me and has concerned me as an example, there may be similar problems throughout the country, since this system was inaugurated in 1956, there obviously have been substantial developments in a number of areas, so it appears to me there obviously is a need for some additional interstate mileage, citing Tampa, St. Pete to Miami as an example. Do you agree with that?