

very, very happy and you would get your rapid transit system and on a per capita basis your people are better able to pay for a program of this nature in your area than the five or six counties I have in the depressed category.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not know your district very well and I do not imagine that you know my district very well.

I do not think the people of my district are for the most part capable of paying additionally for the transportation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Cleveland?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Bingham, you have raised some points here that have been raised by others. I think you should know and I will not take the time to go into detail, but yesterday when the AASHO people testified before this committee—

Mr. BINGHAM. What people?

Mr. CLEVELAND. That is the AASHO people, the American Association of State Highway Officials.

For your information they anticipated precisely some of the remarks you have made today and they had a very detailed study of public attitudes prepared and presented to this committee and I just wanted to inform you that based on those studies, and they are set out here as to the sources, these scientific samples of over 5,000 people, you are not marching in tune with the vast majority of people in this country, and I think you will find that some of these people who were questioned are some of your own constituents.

I suggest to you that you obtain from the committee a copy of that study, because as I say it anticipates almost precisely the evidence you have given us in support of your proposal.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I just say a word on that if I may, Mr. Cleveland?

I would be glad to look at that and I welcome the opportunity. I might say, though, that I have last year sent out a questionnaire to all of my constituents and it included a question on this very subject, whether the communities and States should have the opportunity to use some of the Highway Trust Funds for mass transit purposes and the answer from my constituents was overwhelmingly in the affirmative.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think if the question said even if this means they cannot finish the Interstate System and improve the secondary and primary roads, you might have had a different answer.

There is one other point you made that I think should be met. You said you do not believe we are earmarking funds. We just recently passed, and I know you have long supported land and water conservation. The principle there is that the people who use the parks, the national parks, pay a fee and that fee will go to a fund so land could be acquired for additional parks and improvements of parks we have.

Now, if you are going to come down here and lower the boom on the highway trust fund, I think to be consistent you would have to object to the concept of the land and water conservation fund. And, as I recall, you were one of the strong supporters of that legislation, that is, the Land and Water Conservation Act.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think there is a difference in the sense that one case involved the fee and would be more comparable, let us say, to the use of the fee paid to the toll road; and the other involves a tax.