

over its extreme outside width; nor can two 4-foot-wide pallets be placed side by side in such a van. These things could be accomplished in a 102-inch van.

An additional factor in the need for added width is the fast-moving concept of containerization. The American Standards Association—now the USA Standards Institute—has come forward with a recommendation for containers of the van type to be 8 feet wide, and in 10-foot increments of lengths up to 40 feet. Such a container could be carried on and secured to 102-inch trailers without the need for special attachments or special trailers.

As indicated by Exhibit No. 3 (p. 639) all States except three now are frozen at 96 inches.

When Congress enacted the present restrictions in the 1956 law, it refrained from applying Federal limits on the length and height of motor vehicles, and we believe the reasons for such omissions are as valid now as they were then.

Height and length have nothing to do with protecting the Federal investment in the highways. The roads will be well protected by the single and tandem axle limitations in the proposed bill, and the bridges will be well protected by the gross weight formula in the bill.

We recognize, of course, that height and length can be factors in highway safety, but it does not follow that Federal limits in these areas are either necessary or desirable.

These areas are thoroughly regulated by the individual States, and have been for a great many years. There is nothing in the record, either prior or subsequent to 1956, to indicate the slightest lack of responsibility on the part of the States in the exercise of this authority.

Each State, for example, has regulated length according to its own traffic conditions and its own economic needs. Since these conditions and needs vary greatly in different regions of the country, we find that the approaches to weight and size regulation has also varied.

In the densely populated and big city Northeastern States, conditions historically have dictated shorter vehicles than those permitted and operated in the West. This has been offset to a considerable extent by the fact that the Northeastern States, with better natural soil conditions for road building and with building materials more readily accessible, have been able to allow heavier axle weights.

On the other hand, the Western States have allowed lighter axle loads than the Northeast—and this would continue to be true even if the Western States came up to the axle limits in the pending legislation.

At the same time, however, the West has served its economy by allowing more axles, spread over greater length, thus achieving economic payloads. The average Northeastern State could be placed several times within the vast borders of the average Western State, but the population of many eastern cities exceeds the entire population of several Western States.

The West, with its sparse population spread over great distances rather than concentrated in metropolitan railroad centers, is a great deal more dependent upon truck transportation than other areas.

This is the reason that so many western Senators and Congressmen are anxious for some relaxation of the "freeze" that has gripped the West since the present limitations were made Federal law in 1956.