

and destinations." Thus, he added, "we must somehow obtain better coordination of urban and intercity systems than has been achieved in the past." Dean Seifert went on to say:

Simultaneous funding of both aspects of the transportation research program (intercity and intracity) will permit development of an integrated system having the balance that must be achieved if it is to be truly effective.

Unfortunately, the subcommittee did not approve my amendment, and so today we are considering a bill that in my judgment does only half the job. I hasten to add that half the job is better than no job at all.

#### LEGISLATION STILL PENDING

The amendment I offered to H.R. 5863, Mr. Chairman, was patterned after legislation I introduced June 17—H.R. 9200—to set up a 2-year, \$20 million federally supported research program to develop the new urban transport systems of which I have spoken.

To date 21 other Members have introduced identical legislation: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCCARTHY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The advantages that would be derived from the development of new and effective systems are considerable. They would make the city a better place in which to live and work. They would cut costs which are a result of the present dependence on the automobile. For instance:

Cities would benefit greatly from a reduction in air pollution, caused to a large extent by automotive exhaust, if urban transport systems were in use which were more desirable than the automobile and which did not rely on the internal combustion engine for its locomotion.

Good, automated, and safe urban transport systems would cut the costs resulting from automobile accidents, which now amount to \$4.6 billion annually in urban areas alone.

Efficient urban transport systems would reduce commuter expenses and make it less necessary for cities to build superexpressways at a cost of \$10 to \$15 million a mile.

Urban transport systems that do not require massive roadways would help to make the city a more attractive place in which to live. Not only would the need for freeways which now tend to strangle our cities be reduced, but the design and construction of new systems could complement, rather than compete with, good city planning.

At the same time, under the program I have proposed, attention could be directed to the social and economic problems confronting our cities as they related to transportation—what types of systems are preferred by the city traveler, and what effect they would have on the business of downtown merchants.

While it is true that the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized the expenditure of \$375 million over a 3-year period in aid to communities to help them establish new or refurbish existing mass transit systems, because of funding limitations the program has not been able to provide anywhere near the extent of help that is being demanded of it. Furthermore, a provision of the law permitting the expenditure of up to \$10 million a year, out of the total authorization of \$375 million, for "Research, development, and demonstration projects" has been limited by administrative decision to demonstration projects exclusively.

Writing in the July 1964 issue of *Traffic Quarterly*, Mr. John C. Kohl, Assistant Administrator, Transportation, Housing and Home Finance Agency, said that it was the decision of HHFA that "demonstration projects should be oriented to operational problems and the practical evaluation of techniques or methodology, rather than to preparation of specific plans or the prosecution of basic transportation research." While his remarks referred to the pilot mass transit demonstration program, the predecessor of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, then in operation, the Agency's policy remains unchanged today.

In another statement, made in a speech before the Conference on Responsibilities for Urban Transportation Planning in Newark, N.J., on April 16, 1964, Mr. Kohl predicted that the then pending Mass Transportation Act of 1964 would provide the stimulus necessary to bring about the development of new modes of urban transport. He said:

It is confidently believed that a very modest Federal effort coupled with the program to improve the financial climate of the transit industry can unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities so far as available in the not-too-distant future, better and more appropriate transit systems to complement our unexcelled highway facilities and to round out an effectively balanced system of community transportation.

If we recognize the true nature of the present crisis—that of avoiding the loss of public transportation—we can avert it before it assumes staggering proportions.

Unfortunately, the unlocking of the "great research and development talents of American industries and universities" has not materialized, indicating that the stimulus has not been sufficient.

#### PROPOSED NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the administration is presently for-

mulating a national transportation policy that will attempt to bring some semblance of order out of the conflicting and confusing policies pertaining to the various types of transportation available today. When it does, it certainly will have to take stock of the problem of urban transportation and propose solutions beyond those available at present. I trust that the administration will recognize the very serious need for new modes of urban transport—ones that will move people about cities quickly, safely, and economically, without polluting the air, and satisfying the apparent need of Americans for individual transport while at the same time making possible better city planning. I hope that it will support a federally sponsored research program to develop the new systems.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the House today has a great opportunity to take a constructive step toward meeting the future transportation needs of millions of our citizens. By passing H.R. 5863 we will provide a long-overdue stimulus to the segment of our transportation system which has the greatest potential for economic and efficient service but which, ironically, has been allowed to lapse into a state of disrepair and neglect.

I have a very special interest in this bill for two reasons. First, this legislation is the direct result of a long and valiant campaign for improved rail service which has been waged by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island in the other body, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL. Senator PELL, whose great interest in the measure before us has brought him to the House floor today, has brought uncommon imagination and vigor to the Senate in his first term, and H.R. 5863 stands as one of the greatest monuments to his endeavors.

In 1962, he first started to plead for better rail service between the great urban centers of our heavily populated Northeast megalopolis. He argued, very reasonably, that the railroads could—if they tried—serve a real need for public transportation over intermediate distances which were too long for efficient use of automobiles and too short for efficient use of airplanes. President Kennedy saw the sense in this argument and launched the Department of Commerce on a series of preliminary feasibility studies.

As a result of this first phase of studies, President Johnson last year determined to enter into the greatly expanded program envisioned in the legislation before us today. The \$90 million program we are considering will finance, in the first instance, the construction of new, ultra-modern rail passenger equipment to operate over existing tackage in the 100-mile-per-hour range first envisioned by Senator PELL. It will also finance a substantial infusion of Federal funds for research and development in new techniques of high-speed ground transportation—providing a public investment in this area of transportation which is long overdue because public financing has benefited competing modes of transportation for so long.



And this brings me to the second reason why I have such a special interest in this legislation. In southern New England, and especially in my own State of Rhode Island, we have an ailing, derelict, and I might say almost moribund railroad, the New York, New Haven & Hartford. It is the only railroad to serve my State and I think it is safe to say that the economy of my State would be hard put to get along without it. For this reason, Rhode Island in conjunction with the other States served by the New Haven is now exploring the best way to keep the New Haven alive, hopefully within the framework of the Penn-Central merger. The parties to these negotiations need the best guidance they can get on the future prospects for this service—both in terms of prospective technological development and prospective public demand. Only when they are armed with this information can they proceed to make the kind of wise policy decision which is needed to allocate public and private responsibility for keeping the service alive. The demonstration project contemplated for New England under H.R. 1683 should be of inestimable help in this regard within the next 2 years, and the research and development program will be helpful over the longer term. We need this legislation badly and I urge its speedy passage.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the department of Commerce has proposed a three-part transportation program consisting of railroad demonstration, research and development of new ground transportation systems, and statistical research.

The purpose of such a program is to develop the necessary technological, sociological, and economic information to determine what forms of transportation, and in what combinations, should be utilized in the northeast and other corridors in the future.

There are urgent and extremely practical reasons, both immediate and long range, why this should be done. Population density in the northeast corridor is 854 per square mile and is expected to rise to about 1,100 by 1980. Other regions of the Nation will be almost as densely populated by 1980 when 75 percent of our population will live in metropolitan areas.

This increase in density coupled with greatly increased travel will seriously overburden intercity transportation facilities. Yet the technology of public ground transportation has stagnated for more than 5 decades.

While transportation as represented by highway construction, automobiles, railroads, airlines, pipelines, and ships represents approximately 20 percent of our gross national product, or approximately \$120 billion annually, the amount of research devoted to broad aspects of transportation or to radically new components for our transportation system has been estimated at less than \$65 million.

As a result, ground transportation has lagged behind technological innovations occurring in other fields. Knowledge in such areas as dynamics, control, computers, and propulsion has advanced rapidly as a result of research carried on

in the context of military and space programs. Instead of adapting these findings, progress in ground transportation has been through "products improvement"—simply better versions of old services.

Yet the ultimate of convenience and performance attainable by "products improvements" is not good enough. Testifying before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, William W. Seifert, assistant dean of engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pointed out:

Just as further development of the piston engine would never have led to the advances in aircraft achieved by the introduction of the jet engine \* \* \* really significant advances in the area of high-speed ground transportation would result from work directed toward innovation rather than toward piecemeal improvements of existing technology.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, holds out the promise of such bold research. By making \$64 million available over a 3-year period for development of unconventional ground transportation, the Federal Government will eliminate the risks presently inhibiting private capital and stimulate the required research.

The research and development aspects of this bill represent a new plateau for federally financed research. It looks beyond the refinement of existing technology to fundamentally new concepts of transportation. I urge support for H.R. 5863.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, consistent with the objective of promoting a safe, adequate, economical, and efficient national transportation system, the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, including, but not limited to, components such as materials, aerodynamics, vehicle propulsion, vehicle control, communications, and guideways.*

Mr. GROSS. - Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first two words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. It is most difficult for me to understand why this legislation is necessary in view of the fact that we hear from proponents that 150-mile-an-hour trains have already been developed, and apparently the demonstration areas have been selected—that is between Boston and Washington, D.C.—and the New Haven railroad. Now that everything seems to be in order, why should the taxpayers have to spend \$90 million for the purposes already achieved? I wonder if the committee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] could help me out on this? Should we

not here today be thinking more in terms of the billions that this is going to cost?

Mr. HARRIS. Would the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. First let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I am always flattered when I am requested to give help to the gentleman on important legislation being considered on the floor of the House. He is always judicious and thorough in his study of legislative proposals that are brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when we discuss stadiums.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, and I am, as the gentleman is, very proud of the very fine stadium we have here in Washington and many of us enjoy the benefits of it. I would refer the gentleman to pages 3 and 4 of the committee report with reference to the need for this legislation and the background of the legislation, without going all over it again.

Mr. GROSS. No, I would not want the gentleman to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. I do feel we have arrived at a point where unless something like this is provided, we are going to see this kind and type of transportation deteriorate further.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas that what alarms me is what we are looking at in the future—\$90 million is still a very considerable amount of money where I come from but what we are looking at in the future is what bothers me and concerns me. Once we open the flap of this tent, I do not know the ultimate end in terms of the billions the Federal Government may be asked to expend.

Mr. HARRIS. This is not opening the door. The door was opened in the last Congress with a potential high-cost transportation program to provide commuter transportation within the limits of these great metropolitan areas all over the country. That program is an operational problem as well as efforts to provide some research and demonstration. But this program, in my judgment, is a relatively one-shot proposition. This is an effort to get the regular, established transportation industry of the country to the point that they will pick up the responsibility on their own in an effort to provide such great centers throughout the United States as Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Denver, and many other places with the best mode of transportation possible between these centers.

Mr. GROSS. It would be most helpful if the gentleman could give us some assurance that upon the expenditure of \$90 million we would not then be asked to come up with several billions of dollars to carry out the construction of high-speed surface transportation systems.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for that assurance.