

Mr. SPOONER. And there will probably be as many signs with all of the problems that Government administration will make for them.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, their law is something like 10,000 licensed businesses in Vermont and they are each entitled to four signs but now have to get them from the State, is that right?

Mr. SPOONER. That is correct.

Mr. BARBOUR. They only have about 3,000 signs in the State now.

Mr. CRAMER. In your statement you say there are four jurisdictions, Hawaii, Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, a total of 950 signs must be removed.

However, according to the Bureau, it indicates that only 155 signs will be removed in those four jurisdictions, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SPOONER. I can quickly straighten out that disparity.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand some modification is needed to balance it. That is not the point. The point is that the Federal Government is not really getting much for its money in those four jurisdictions.

Mr. SPOONER. They are insignificant in my opinion.

Mr. CRAMER. Certainly, in my opinion, for the amount of money that is supposed to go into those areas.

We have had this discussion about national standards. We had it in the last consideration of the 1966 act. Everyone was in agreement, as I understand it. Certainly, I felt that way; and the legislative history shows that it was not the intention that there be "national standards." And I think the act is very clear on this point.

Now, doesn't it appear, however, that the manner in which the Secretary has unilaterally promulgated standards, for instance, pertaining to the definition of unzoned commercial industry areas, that we are going right in the direction of national standards?

Mr. SPOONER. That is very true. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that never has there been a more inconsistent bit of testimony than that in which the Secretary said in one breath, that, "I cannot emphasize too strongly that there are no such things as national standards," or words to that effect; and then went on to say, "However, the only absolute requirement upon which we would have to insist would be the existence of at least one commercial activity in any such unzoned area."

It seems to me a complete contradiction within the terms of the same testimony.

Mr. CRAMER. At the hearings on the Senate bill, it became quite clear that the Federal/State agreements defining unzoned commercial areas, are expected to be initiated by the States.

Mr. SPOONER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And I recall our debate on this and the conference reports on it and our lengthy discussions of it; that was my impression of how it has worked out.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, actually of the 17 agreements signed, oh, perhaps less than half were open end. That is to say that the State officials were given complete blank check authority to make whatever agreement they want; and a good number of those have signed agreements. Those agreements look as if they were cut—as we say in our statement—from the same mimeographed stencil. They do not evidence any mutual bargaining and as you know, attached to our statement as appendix 2, is a résumé of those provisions of the agreements that