

Mr. McCARTHY. Another contention was made that this would result in lower rates, that the benefits would be passed onto the shippers. And then I read, I think the same day, that they are now before the ICC seeking increased rates. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. BRADY. I am not familiar with the specifics of the petition for rate increases, but the general thrust of the truckers testimony seems to be that this will bring about a lower cost to the consumer. At the same time, the Congress is considering weights, they are pushing for higher rates to the consumer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where do you get your figures here? You say this is only 250,000 and we had disagreement on that yesterday on how many trucks we are talking about. Where do you get that figure you used, 250,000, which you say is only 7 percent.

Mr. BRADY. It is a very small percentage of the vehicle population.

Mr. McCARTHY. What do you base that on?

Mr. BRADY. This is based on information in House Document 354 of the 88th Congress. This is the report that Mr. Cramer mentioned a moment ago, "Maximum Desirable Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Operated on the Federal-Aid Systems."

On page 109 of that report relating to four and five axles and heavier vehicles, the report indicates that only a third of the loaded vehicles weighed more than 60,000 pounds.

Now, we are talking about substantially in excess of 60,000 pounds, and a third of these vehicles could probably use to advantage higher permitted axle weights or greater lengths. These are the four to five axle combinations. According to the report, the number of such combinations which could use heavier weights was 190,000 in 1962.

Now, in the 1967 edition of Motor Truck Facts, on page 28 of that booklet, it is indicated there were 732,558 four and five axle combinations registered in 1966. One-third of this number—on the assumption about the same number now as in 1966 could use heavier sizes and weights, if permitted—one-third of this number is 244,186. So we just rounded it off and said 250,000 vehicles.

(At this point Mr. Kluczynski resumed the chair.)

Mr. McCARTHY. That would not jibe with another representation made to me that they paid 40 percent of the trust fund. Do you have any figures on what the heavy trucks contribute to the trust fund?

Mr. BRADY. These figures are in another report. Just a moment.

I have before me the Supplementary Report on Highway Cost Allocation Study, made by the Secretary of Commerce to the Congress in the 89th Congress, first session. There is a summary, table 4, on page 20 of this document, which shows, if we consider these same four and five axle vehicles, and larger vehicles, that they contribute \$368.9 million of the total of expended truck fund receipts for that year of \$3,354 million, which represents 11 percent of the trust fund revenue in 1964 contributed by the combinations of four or more axles.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would you say that ratio would be fairly close today?

Mr. BRADY. It would be fairly close today, although subsequent to this report, all of the truck excise taxes were put into the trust fund: only 50 percent of them were deposited in the trust fund in 1964. Of course, the excise taxes on passenger cars goes to general fund, as you know.