

want to take on a lot of other expenditures. It just seems to me this is one heck of a way to run the highway construction program in this country, with constant cutbacks, with short-range planning concerning supplemental appropriations.

It is the type of program that can be conducted only if it is on a long-range plan basis. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLER. Nothing could be truer. It is so important to the highway departments and industry to redefine the role of the Federal Government.

To us the legislative history is clear, going back to the original study of the joint committee in 1911, but it seems to me we have gotten off the track.

Mr. FALLON. If the gentleman will yield, I might say further that I have suggested to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House that if possible he find some way to lift that particular item out of the supplemental and pass that, and then go on and talk about the additional expenditures which have no relationship to the \$400 million we are talking about.

I do not know whether he has been able to accomplish that or not; but I certainly will ask him what he has done about the suggestion I made to him the other day.

Mr. MILLER. That is most encouraging, Chairman Fallon. So far as we can ascertain, there is no controversy, per se, over the \$400 million item.

Mr. FALLON. That is what I understand, too.

Mr. MILLER. If we could pull that out from the supplemental bill and put it through separately, it would be a great help to many, many persons.

Mr. CRAMER. Relating to your suggestion concerning the increased \$250 million in the urban areas, that increase, I assume, is for the TOPICS program, is it not?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you really feel that the TOPICS program, as a new program, should get priority over the Interstate System?

That would be the effect of increasing this \$500 million in the ABC system.

Mr. MILLER. Congressman Cramer, hopefully, some day soon, the treatment of the Interstate System will be approached factually.

Unfortunately, up to the present time, as you have mentioned, there has been stretchout after stretchout, and each time a new program is proposed—and many of them are highly desirable—the net result is to stretch out the interstate program.

I quite agree, Congressman Cramer, with your position that the interstate program should be firmed up and financed properly. This stretchout and stretchout is a costly thing.

Mr. CRAMER. When you recommend a quarter of a billion a year to go for TOPICS as an increase in their program, you are in effect, recommending that we take it out of the interstate. I do not know whether that is your intention or whether you think it is justified to start this new program with that amount of money and take it out of the present interstate funds.

Mr. MILLER. Congressman Cramer, hopefully the Congress someday will find a change in conditions and will face up to the responsibilities