

Mr. BRESNAHAN. Yes, sir; because I think some of those statements need some clarification.

Mr. CRAMER. I gathered that you might want to comment on them, and I was going to ask you that question, but time does not permit. So would you submit that as well?

Mr. BRESNAHAN. Thank you.

Before Mr. Schwengel leaves now——

Mr. CRAMER. Is that all right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Yes.

Mr. BRESNAHAN. How will these questions be made available?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Maybe we can arrange to get together in my office, or I will write the questions out and I will be in touch or you be in touch with me. I will try to make some arrangements with the questions.

Mr. BRESNAHAN. If you will be good enough to prepare them and just give us a call, we will come and get them.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Schwengel will submit the questions.

Gentlemen, thank you for your appearance here.

That concludes the hearing on the highway legislation.

(The questions and replies referred to above are as follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman,
Subcommittee of Roads,
Public Works Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. William A. Bresnahan of American Trucking Associations, Inc., with questions and answers with some conclusions and observations of my own for the Committee hearings.

Sincerely yours.

FRED SCHWENGEL, *Member of Congress.*

JUNE 18, 1968.

Mr. WILLIAM A. BRESNAHAN,
American Trucking Associations, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. BRESNAHAN: This is in response to a hand-delivered letter and also to the unanimous request made by me and granted during the time of the hearings on the bill that concerns the problem of weight, length and width in the trucking industry.

After reading the reports of the committee in the Senate it was quite apparent that the hearings didn't bring out a full and complete discussion of the facts and factors that relate to the provisions of the bill on width, length and weight under consideration before that committee. This was the reason for my pursuing this question further.

Therefore, I am sorry that we have not had nor apparently will have an opportunity for discussion and colloquy that would have been afforded if the hearings had been continued. I really believe that in fairness to the trucking interests and those who have the responsibility of building and maintaining highways that continued hearings would have served the public interest. Since that is not to be, we will proceed under unanimous consent request which was obtained and hope better insight of problems and solutions will result.

Now the questions:

1. How many trucks of four axles or more are likely to be able to take advantage of heavier axle weights and heavier gross weights if section 127 is amended as proposed in S. 2658 as referred to the House?

2. How do the Western States compare with those in the East relating to average ton miles hauled under existing provisions of section 127, Title 23?

3. How many dues-paying members do you have in the American Trucking Association for whom you speak?