

First, we believe Highway Trust Fund money should be used solely for its intended purpose—meeting highway construction expenses. We do not believe the money should be diverted from this essential purpose and used for design, construction or maintenance of public off-street parking facilities or other non-highway purposes.

Second, we note that Highway Trust Fund money already seems to be in short supply—inasmuch as Section 2 of the bill authorizes a stretch-out to 1974 of construction of the Interstate System. Further shortening of the money supply, by using it for parking facilities, would be detrimental to completion of the Interstate System.

Third, we view this proposal for federally financing fringe parking facilities as an example of unwarranted government competition with private enterprise. We do not believe it appropriate for the Federal Government to encourage the provision of parking facilities by other levels of government. Where it is desirable to supply free or below cost off-street parking, the businessman and property owners benefitting therefrom should provide it without government subsidy, as they have been doing.

For the foregoing reasons, the Chamber requests deletion of Section 14 from H.R. 17134.

If there is a sufficiently strong interest in a Federal subsidy for providing publicly-owned fringe parking facilities, we would recommend that the subject be heard in separate hearings, where it could be judged on its own merits.

I would appreciate you making this letter a part of the record of Committee hearings.

Cordially,

DON A. GOODALL,
General Manager, Legislative Action.

STANDARD LIME & REFRACTORIES CO.,
Baltimore, Md., June 6, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
*Member, Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLUCZYNSKI: We urge your support for enactment of House Bill 14474 as this legislation would liberalize existing limitations and enable States so desiring to modernize their present motor truck size and weight standards.

As you know, present maximum truck size and weight limitations which were established by the Congress in 1956 are based on standards adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials in 1946.

Affirmative action is required to allow individual States an opportunity to adopt modern size and weight standards.

We respectfully request that our views be made a part of the record.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS RUMFORD II, *President.*

INSURANCE INSTITUTE FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1968.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety earnestly seeks the support of your subcommittee for the traffic and highway safety authorizations contained in H.R. 17134 and H.R. 16994.

If the traffic safety program of the nation is to go forward it is essential that the states, the local communities, and others concerned with the mounting highway carnage be assured of Congressional leadership and willingness to spend tax dollars for this purpose. A fine start has been made in dealing with this massive social problem, due in no small part to the leadership exhibited by yourself and other members of the House Committee on Public Works.

From our close association with the problem it is apparent that the minimum authorization for state and community highway programs for 1970 and 1971 should be the \$50 and \$75 million figures respectively cited in the two House