

and I think cutbacks are going to be necessary, or delays at least in the highway construction and make it possible to undertake some of the much more urgent and much more critically needed upgrading of mass transportation facilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Thank you.

I notice in your statement you are introducing new legislation that would change the name of the highway trust fund to the transportation trust fund and to increase the resources of the fund by adding the revenue of the manufacturers' tax on automobiles.

I am not opposed to the mass transportation. I do not think any member of this subcommittee is opposed to mass transportation.

I do not favor changing the highway trust fund to the transportation trust fund.

The gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is in his proposal to move to mass transit as a program to be funded from this transportation fund, why he has elected to put additional burdens insofar as the program is concerned upon the automobile user and not return to an excise on the mass transit ticket or charge since you are electing to benefit the mass transit user directly by the program, why would you suggest in your bill that you have proposed that the automobile users' money be used for this purpose and apparently overlooking any kind of an excise upon the mass transit user to contribute to the benefit of the mass transit program.

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, I think Mr. Edmondson, this gets to the essence of the question as to whether this type of tax in general should be earmarked for highway purposes.

My view is that it should not.

Now, partly that is a matter of straight economics that the people who generally speaking use automobiles and use trucks and are taxed for this purpose are in a position to pay these taxes.

The millions of people who have to use the mass transit facilities are not in a position to pay additionally for them.

As a matter of fact, they are already in most cities operating in a very difficult situation. I think the same question would apply to the addition of a new, of additional tax as does the original. I would prefer, if it were feasible, as I have indicated to eliminate the idea of the earmarking altogether and make all of these taxes subject to the allocation by the Congress and in the normal way.

I have suggested this as possibly a measure that might make it somewhat more palatable, more easy to move in the right direction here by adding to the resources available so that the cutbacks in the highway program would not be as large as they might otherwise have to be.

I would like to add to that one other thought if I may, Mr. Chairman, and that is that many of those who do use automobiles and who do pay taxes do not get to use the Interstate System very much. This is particularly true in New York. They are operating on city streets and so they are not getting much benefit out of the Interstate System.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the first place with the increasing diversion of interstate revenue as to expressways for the cities which is a recent pattern we have been seeing a lot of, you do not find many people who are not getting the benefit of the interstate highway money.