

small businessman will not; is that correct? So you advertise the big one, and the little fellow won't be able to. That will be the effect; will it not?

Mr. SPOONER. I think that is true, Mr. Cramer. I think it is also true, too, because traditionally the sign that that small man has been able to afford has been the rural sign as compared to the large national sign that has been concentrated in the cities.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I am impressed with the fact—from the mail I get, Mr. Chairman—that it is largely to the effect, "Get the signs off the highways," in many instances, but no one seems to appreciate the fact that this does not get the signs off the highway. It just removes them a little bit farther from the highway, and they end up being larger and more monstrous signs.

On page 5 of your statement, you discuss the contrast of control of cities versus rural signs.

As I understand it, under the present law, all rural signs, except on-the-premise signs, must be removed, which is a total of about 839,000.

Mr. SPOONER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. While in effect, none of the city signs need to be removed.

Mr. SPOONER. That is true.

Mr. CRAMER. Isn't this rather discriminatory? What is the effect of it in your opinion?

Mr. SPOONER. We think it is completely unjustifiable discrimination, Mr. Cramer, and this particularly is so because of the fact that there are at least as many justifications for the small rural sign as there are for the larger city sign.

Mr. CRAMER. Now, I talked to some constituents who have traveled even on the Interstate System, many pretty long distances, and a number of them have complained to me that they have not, in traveling these highways, have had enough sign information to find the necessary accommodations; be it gasoline or rooming or other more immediate needs; and so my question is: Isn't it necessary to have some balance between beautification on the one hand, and the basic needs of information on the part of the motorist on the other hand?

Mr. SPOONER. I think that is entirely true.

Mr. CRAMER. Frankly, I have some people say to me that traveling interstate at night is rather frightening to them because they don't know where to find the necessary accommodations when traveling long distances.

Mr. SPOONER. Somewhat along that line, if I might interject, the Vermont situation is interesting, Congressman, in that, as you know, after having gone through a number of gyrations alleging their act this way and that, in 1968 they passed their House bill 450 which absolutely barred, except for on-premise signs, all privately owned outdoor advertising; but then the State itself went into the business, but recognizing the need for directional signs of the kind that you are now speaking of, took this business over, in my mind, in somewhat of a socialistic manner, and we now are going to have as many signs as ever, except now they are going to be State owned.

Mr. CRAMER. Then the effect in Vermont has been that you have socialization of the sign industry.