

this tremendous need for modernizing our primary highways and expanding our secondary roads.

Our primary highways, I would say, that would connect between centers of population, between cities where we do not have good arterial connections at the present time, and the secondary system that acts as feeders.

I think as far as the statement is concerned about the development of suburbia, all of our records show that the core of the city is not growing particularly fast. There is very slight growth in the core of the big city.

But in suburbia, where the population explosion is taking place, there is greater growth. That is where we see a need for primary and secondary roads, to serve those areas.

Mr. CLAUSEN. This committee generally feels that there is a direct relationship between road construction that provides access into some of the rural sections of this country and economic growth. In many ways, this will do more to provide relief from the pressures that are building up in the cities than any one thing I can think of.

Do you agree with this?

Mr. MORTON. Yes. I think our Interstate System is doing a great deal in that direction, toward fostering this economic growth back into the areas that are not so heavily populated.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Morton, either you or Mr. Stapp testified this morning that you were doing away with this 10 percent penalty. Did I not hear somebody say something about doing away with that?

Mr. MORTON. We are opposed to any penalty being associated with the highway beautification program.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. We had 100-percent penalty, but in the amendment we adopted a 10-percent penalty.

Mr. CRAMER. First it was no penalty, and we lost that.

Mr. MORTON. Some of us have thought that instead of a penalty there might be a small bonus that would stimulate States to showing good taste and judgment in executing at least a reasonable beautification program.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. In the State of Florida, for instance, with the encouragement of Congress, and it was quite proper they went into a very substantial safety program. It is going to cost a lot of money. Lo and behold, when their first year's appropriation came up, it was about one-third of the authorization. This year it is no better.

There seems to be no great push, even to get more money into safety. But there is a terrible push to get that beauty money going.

I just cannot see how, logically, you can put beauty ahead of safety, No. 1; and No. 2, we make all these promises of these big authorizations to the States. We insist on them acting, and if you do not act we are going to give you a 10-percent penalty on all your highways.

They go ahead and act and then we do not provide the money for it. That is not very fair treatment, is it?

Mr. MORTON. No, it is not.

Mr. CRAMER. That is about what is happening, is it not?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.