

to 1978, and that being the case, where does the money for the new metropolitan system come from?

Mr. MARSH. We are not, as an organization, in a position to state anything very significant on that, I am sure. We recognize it as a serious problem. That we only are emphasizing the plea that because the urban metropolitan needs are so great and are going to grow, that there be readjustment in thinking and finally, I must state personally, I believe this is inevitable. I think it is inevitable within 10 years that there will be marked changes in concepts of what the program calls for.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I do not disagree with that kind of statement of yours. However, I do not foresee in the next few years at least, of getting a substantial additional fund from the trust fund, with which we can go forward with this long range planning of new systems such as the new metropolitan system and I gather your recommendation was that we consider the matter in this year.

Mr. MARSH. We would like to see it considered right now because we think it is so urgent, but we recognize the very real problems which you gentlemen face and I would hate to be facing them myself, but I think what we are really trying to say is that there just needs to be a modification in the concept of what we are trying to do and this modification, if it comes about and I am positive it will, in my own mind, may help to do something to help in this part of it.

Aside from that fund, it has got to come from taxation and that is all.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Clausen?

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay special commendation to Mr. Marsh for his testimony before the committee and to bring to the attention of my colleagues the extraordinary performance, the overall effectiveness, of Mr. Marsh when he appeared with the U.S. delegation before the 10th Pan-American Highway Congress.

I went down to that Congress, representing the committee, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Marsh was the most diligent man I have ever seen performing with our own delegation and I want to welcome him before the committee as a very efficient delegate.

Mr. Marsh, in your statement, you say that the secondary system should be limited to only the most important secondary routes.

Now, you know under existing laws, section 103(c), title 23, of the United States Code, the secondary system, may include farm and market roads, county and local rural roads, and so forth.

Now, the question I would like to ask you is, would you define what you mean by the most important secondary roads and secondly, would you suggest a change in the definition of the secondary system?

Mr. MARSH. Well, I think this gets to one basic point. In the first place, let me be very quick to say that I am sure that no one in the institute is anything but having a desire to see all of the necessary roads built in this country.

I think that what is involved here gets to the question of the problem ahead as far as Federal aid is concerned and the sense of where the obligation or the responsibility begins and ends.

I think that our thought is that, and know our thought is that as far as the secondary road, there should be a fairly sharp cutoff with the idea that other roads still need to be built, but that this is not the