

of steep slopes just off the shoulder area; the provision of rest areas—all these, and other procedures, go well beyond esthetic considerations.

It would be well, we believe, to document the extent to which so-called beautification procedures are, in actuality, procedures which enhance the efficiency of the highway as a mode of transportation. Eventually, it would be logical to use the Highway Trust Fund as the medium for channeling revenue into such improvements. On the other hand, those expenditures which have esthetic value only, should be considered as such as should be funded in the same manner as other Federal expenditures in the general area of esthetics, recreation and the enjoyment of the outdoors.

A similar analysis might well be made of the safety programs, to determine which of the activities being carried out or proposed relate directly to the highway facility—the engineering part of the “three E’s”, engineering, education and enforcement.

It seems reasonable to us that all highway safety and scenic enhancement expenditures at the Federal level which are directly attributable to the highway construction program could logically be charged to the Highway Trust Fund *if* the fund is augmented sufficiently to be able to support such expenditures.

By the same token, safety and beautification measures which are more directly related to the vehicle and the driver should *not* be paid for from the Highway Trust Fund.

We take the position, as we have in the past, that the construction of roads in the Federal domain, including forest highways and public lands roads, should be paid for from the general fund of the Treasury.

We support the position that a more liberal policy with respect to relocation payments would be equitable and in the public interest. We are not altogether convinced of the wisdom of the Administration’s position that relocation procedures for the Federal-aid highway program should be identical to a uniform relocation assistance plan applicable to all Federal and Federally-assisted programs. The fact that the States have the primary responsibility for relocation assistance, coupled with the fact that the individual State highway departments have, in many cases, developed their own workable procedures, casts doubt on the desirability of trying to make all conform to Federal requirements. We hope that this Subcommittee will take up the matter of relocation assistance and make its own judgments rather than accepting any proposed uniform plan which has not been carefully correlated with the Federal-aid highway program.

While we have no doubt as to the general desirability of fringe parking as a means of reducing traffic pressures in the central business district, we do not believe that the proposition contained in H.R. 17134 can be justified as a proper charge against the Highway Trust Fund at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, ARBA again goes on record as being unalterably opposed to the application of Davis-Bacon procedures to the Federal-aid highway program, and particularly the extension of such procedures to the ABC program.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the privilege of presenting the views of the American Road Builders’ Association regarding the very significant legislation before this committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:

We sincerely appreciate this opportunity to comment on the legislation before this committee, both the Administration’s bill, H.R. 17134, and the bill sponsored by Chairman Fallon and Chairman Kluczynski, H.R. 16994.

In studying the various proposals contained in this legislation, and having heard the testimony of the Secretary of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administrator before this subcommittee last Thursday, we are impressed by the fact that the legislation incorporates a number of innovations, almost all of which would result in added costs to the Highway Trust Fund, and that, in the absence of any real prospect that the revenue sources of the Highway Trust Fund will be augmented in the near future, these added costs will, as a practical matter, result in a decrease in the amount of money available for the Interstate program.