

It might be noted that there has been no increase in the ABC since 1964, and that the total of the ABC program since the inception of the 1956 program has been only \$300 million, which is not enough to meet increased costs and changes in standards, much less providing for an acceleration of the program.

That \$300 million is indeed meager when you think of the adjustments in the Interstate program ranging in round figures, Mr. Chairman, from \$25 billion at the start to almost \$50 billion today. So we see the great deficiencies that are continuing to be created in the ABC programs.

We have advocated that the ABC authorizations be increased in amounts at least sufficient to reflect rising unit construction costs, and the added costs which come about due to improved safety standards and greater emphasis on environmental quality.

Many of the advanced standards which we favor, applicable to the Interstate System, find their influence in the ABC program.

In the legislation before you, the administration has asked that TOPICS be funded at the level of \$250 million per year. The TOPICS money, added to the \$250 million regularly added to urban construction under the ABC formula, would double the Federal-aid funds available for the construction of non-Interstate highways.

We believe that this increase in urban funds should be accompanied by an increase in funds authorized for the rural Federal-aid roads. Therefore, we propose that the TOPICS authorization be accompanied by the authorization of an additional \$250 million for each of the 2 fiscal years 1970 and 1971 to augment the apportionments for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems.

Then in the following text, Mr. Chairman, you can see the effect of this recommendation.

To sum up, without boring the committee with details on dollars and cents, our recommendation would have a net result of providing an increase of 331 $\frac{1}{3}$  percent for Federal-aid primary money, 331 $\frac{1}{3}$  percent for Federal-aid secondary, and 100 percent for Federal-aid urban. It may seem inconsistent for us to come before this committee recommending an increase in the ABC program authorizations at a time when highway construction levels are being limited administratively.

As Secretary Boyd advised the committee last Thursday, another substantial cutback in the highway program is under consideration in connection with the surtax legislation now pending in Congress.

We deplore these cutbacks. In the long run, we believe, they increase the costs of highway construction by disrupting the programs of the highway departments and the long-range planning of the industry. Program disruption, in our view, is equivalent to economic waste. We shall continue to express this position as forcefully as we can.

It is our opinion, from the best information we can obtain, that the proposed increase in the ABC program of \$500 million is within the capability of the trust fund, providing these other cats and dogs are not tacked onto it.

We believe it should be made in spite of the prospects of continued cutbacks with the hope that it will be possible to put the entire Federal-aid highway authorization to work before the 1969 construction season begins.