

the validity of State enactments prior to 1956, it also recognizes State enactments subsequent to 1956 which did not violate the Federal law. This is reasonable, logical, and essential.

Any progress which might be expected to flow from the proposed legislation would be destroyed by elimination of the "grandfather" clause.

In fact, such an action would be so retrogressive and devastating that the industry for which we speak—and probably many of the others interested in the legislation, both private and official—would be forced to oppose the legislation.

The present laws of the States were enacted—in many cases 30 years ago—for good reason and in good faith. These States have built their highway systems, including their segments of the Interstate System, to fit their laws.

We cannot imagine the Congress, after all these years, requiring the States to wipe out decades of progress. You would be giving a little with the right hand, and taking away much more with the left.

The "grandfather" clause is just as reasonable and sound now as it was when it was enacted, and it is absolutely vital that it be continued.

That concludes my direct statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOWARD. Thank you very much, Mr. Bresnahan. It was a fine statement.

I would like to just mention one thing concerning the widths of trucks.

As I understand it, many States where we have a divider between lanes of traffic, there is a feeling the vehicle may use the entire width of the roadway up to the divider. In my own State of New Jersey, I believe there is in use a divider which has a 4-foot wide base and that also there is a limit of the side overhang of the trucks beyond the wheels of 2 feet, which would mean that trucks coming in opposite directions alongside the divider, if they have their wheels at the edge of the pavement alongside the divider, the 2-foot overhang on each side would have them practically touching as they pass.

This does not include any additional space that might be taken by the mirror of the vehicle.

If the truck width is increased and the width between the wheels remains the same, would this not give a natural overhang that would cause trucks whose wheels are on the pavement at the edge of this central 4-foot divider the great possibility of collisions of trucks moving toward each other?

Mr. Bresnahan. Do you want to answer that?

Mr. KIBBEE. I do not think that I follow you, sir, on your 2-foot extension.

Our vehicle is now 96 inches wide. It would be 96 inches wide at its wheels and at its side and then the mirrors might extend as much as 7 to 8 inches on either side of this vehicle. So that the dimension that the overhang, if I understand your question correctly, would be an overhang of approximately 8 inches on each side, and then the two trucks passing would absorb 16 inches. If I understand you correctly, there were 4 feet in which to absorb this 16 inches, is that correct?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.