

We share the concern of all taxpayers relative to increasing costs to build and maintain adequate and safe road systems, and are opposed to such liberalization of weight and size provisions for trucks as would permit increasingly damaging weights on roads not constructed for such weights. However, in the interest of economic transport of goods, including apples, we are also concerned that adequate capacities and weight allowances be permitted to provide for greatest efficiencies in transport.

Modification of existing weight limitations and width limitations which will still retain reasonable and realistic weights for the protection of roads and the safety of non-truck vehicles on the roads . . . we concur in and endorse.

We appreciate that this presents a real challenge of achievement, but it is our understanding that weight and size relationship formulas are being proposed which would retain these protective features.

Sincerely,

FRED P. COREY, *Executive Vice President.*

AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Denver, Colo., June 4, 1968.

HON. JOHN KLUCZYNSKI,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads,
 House Committee on Public Works,
 Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: Reference is made to H.R. 14474, a bill to amend Section 127 of Title 23 of the U.S. Code relating to vehicle weight and width limitations on the Interstate System, in order to make certain increases in such limitations.

The American National Cattlemen's Association, at its 71st Annual Convention in January, 1968, passed the following resolution on this subject entitled, "Truck Uniformity":

"Whereas, a bill has been introduced in Congress to enable the various states to adopt uniform standards for trucks in interstate commerce; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American National Cattlemen's Association endorse this legislation in principle."

Transportation of livestock by motor truck is a tremendously important subject to us since a very high percentage of our product is moved to market in motor trucks. We believe that this type of permissive legislation is important to the achievement of greater efficiency of motor truck operation in the marketing of livestock.

We ask that you please make this letter a part of the hearing record. Thank you.

Cordially,

C. W. McMILLAN.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN KLUCZYNSKI,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads,
 House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Here is a statement on behalf of the Association of American Railroads, expressing our opposition to enactment at this time of S. 2658, which is now pending before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Committee on Public Works.

Our national transportation policy demands that the existing inequitable situation between motor carriers and railroads, resulting from inadequate highway user charges on heavy units, not be aggravated or worsened, as would be done by this bill. Highway cost burdens should be assumed by those users occasioning such burdens. If such is not done, the nation's available transportation resources are used in uneconomic and inefficient ways. S. 2658 cannot be considered separate and apart from this principle. While your Committee may have no direct jurisdiction over the measure and level of user charges, it seems to us that it does have a general responsibility imposed upon it by the national transportation policy.