

Now, as I understood in talking with you, Mr. Spooner, because we are faced with this anticrime bill coming up in a few minutes, you want to put this statement of yours in the record; and you, Mr. Barbour, have a brief statement you want to make?

Mr. BARBOUR. We can just file our statement.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Barbour, we would appreciate it if you would file the statement in its entirety, and Mr. Cramer is on the floor, as you know, and I was in hopes that he would be here, but we have very, very important legislation that he is very much interested in. He has to be on the floor and, of course, he cannot be in both places at once.

We will put your entire statement into the record at this point. (Prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF DONALD S. BARBOUR FOR ROADSIDE BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: my name is Donald S. Barbour. I am a member of the Executive Committee of Roadside Business Association, 1430 Dain Tower, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and designated by it to make this presentation. I am also President of Barbour Outdoor Advertising, Inc., of Orlando, Florida. Paul L. Spooner, Jr., RBA's General Counsel, accompanies me.

RBA is a 32 year old national trade association of outdoor advertising companies, sign manufacturers, and companies which use outdoor advertising to sell their goods and services. The latter category includes 5,000 motel members of the Motel Association of America which, in turn, is an affiliated member of RBA.

Some of RBA's members are national concerns; many others are small companies. The overriding fact is that the signs which they erect, manufacture or use are placed almost exclusively in rural areas—not in cities.

I therefore speak for rural signs. I appear against that part of Section 8 of the proposed Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968 (H.R. 17134) which would authorize appropriations for Title I of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, relating to the control of outdoor advertising. We respectfully oppose the authorization of any money for this purpose. We do so not only for the compelling general reason (an unjustifiable expenditure in this time of financial crisis, involvement in Viet Nam, racial strife, problems in the cities), but also because Title I Beautification Act is astoundingly unreasonable, discriminatory and unworkable, in our opinion.

We would like to see this Federal Act amended, if this can now be done—fairly, wisely and adequately. For it might be possible to devise a moderate approach so fashioned as to be consistent with the fact of financial crisis and the other general, national problems. Otherwise we urge that no money be authorized—not only because of the national problems, but also to halt the positive economic damage even now being wrought in the name of the Beautification Act in its present form.

I request that the three appendices attached to this statement, and any parts of this statement which I may not read, be made a part of the record.

In summary, the Federal Act presents basic difficulties, in our opinion. In terms of *results* they are:

1. The nearly total destruction of off-premise *rural* signs, thousands of outdoor advertising companies that operate in rural areas, and the giant part of the 150,000 jobs directly provided by *off-premise* outdoor companies.
2. The serious (and in many cases fatal) harm to the 500,000 motorist-oriented businesses and other users of rural signs, typically small businessmen.
3. The high cost of compensating for a near wholesale condemnation of rural signs, existing city signs being largely untouched.

The basic difficulties in terms of *cause* are:

1. The failure to recognize that much of our vast rural territory is not beautiful at all, and that other parts are not nearly scenic enough, relatively, to justify the destruction and waste (and the related human suffering) just mentioned.