

the regular appropriations process. This alternative would provide the advantage of more frequent Congressional examination of transportation priorities and greater flexibility in controlling spending levels for transportation programs. But mass transportation has depended upon the regular appropriations process for some time, and has not been adequately funded. In addition, powerful political forces support the continuance of the Highway Trust Fund—political forces that would constitute a formidable obstacle to any plan to scrap the Fund.

The second alternative would be to expand the scope and resources of the Trust Fund in such a way that it becomes more than only a highway trust fund. Only a part of the several manufacturers, retailers, and users taxes relating to transportation currently accrue to the Highway Trust Fund, and those funds can be employed only for roads and highways. The Trust Fund, however, might gradually be expanded to receive all Federal transportation-related taxes. Such an expanded trust fund would provide funds for the development of all modes of transportation. This second alternative, it seems to me, is a more viable one. It is politically more feasible. Furthermore, it would insure a continuing source of transportation funds.

I have previously (in 1965) proposed and supported legislation that would permit the States to elect to use some of the funds they receive from the Highway Trust Fund for mass transportation development rather than roads and highways. But under that legislation, any funds used for mass transportation by the States would mean that much less funds for roads and highways—a reduction which the States have been unwilling, if not unable to incur.

While the greater need for improved mass transportation and the lesser need for further highway development demands that some cutback of highway spending be effected, it is unlikely that it would be feasible to cut back highway spending by the full amount that will have to be invested in mass transportation facilities. The magnitude of the mass transportation need and the projected costs are too great.

What is needed is a trust fund with greater resources, that will provide a continuing sources of funds for mass transportation considerably greater than in the past, and that will also allow cutbacks in road and highway spending.

With this in mind, I am introducing new legislation that would:

(1) Change the name of the Highway Trust Fund to the Transportation Trust Fund, and

(2) Increase the resources of the Fund by adding the revenues from the manufacturer's excise tax on automobiles now allocated to the general fund.

These additional funds—amounting to about \$1.5 billion a year—along with funds released by any future cutbacks in highway programs, would be available to states and metropolitan areas for construction and upgrading of mass transportation facilities. This legislation, if enacted, would be a major step not only toward putting mass transportation in its proper place in our transportation priorities, but also toward the establishment of a broader financial framework—a Transportation Trust Fund—that should eventually consist of all transportation-related taxes and support all of our transportation needs in a more rational and balanced manner.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished subcommittee and I am afraid that my position as I outline it here is not going to be a very immediately popular position to this subcommittee.

Basically, what I am suggesting here is that first of all I think that the distribution of Federal funds as between the highways and the mass transportation networks of our country is way out of proportion.

During the period of, for example 3 years from 1964 to 1967 the Federal Government spent 30 times as much in the highway program as it did for mass transit.

I realize, of course, that this committee is not responsible for the funds or the authorization for mass transit purposes. My view is that we should be in a position, we in the Congress should be in a position to make judgments and the community should be in a position to make judgments as to where it is more important to spend our transportation