

cope with other urban ills. It is a matter of the most urgent priority to them and to us.

I do not claim that mass rapid transit is a panacea which will cure all our urban ailments. I do say that how we solve our transportation problems will have an effect on every one of our social, economic, and physical problems. And I say that if we do not solve our transportation problems swiftly and with some thought for the ultimate consequences, we will not have cities worth preserving.

Thank you.

Mr. BARRETT. We certainly appreciate your coming across the continent from your great city of Seattle and giving us the benefit of your firsthand knowledge and excellent recommendations.

You know, I think the committee wants to brag a little bit. May I say, our Banking Committee is proud to have put through the urban mass transit legislation in 1964. That was a great breakthrough, and our ability to get it passed surprised many people.

Title III of H.R. 12946 would provide enough funds to continue the mass transit program through fiscal 1968, and we intend to see that this program, which has such great promise continues to have the funds it needs.

I just want to ask you one question. I had the opportunity to see a very fine rapid transit system—the rapid transportation in Tokyo, going from Tokyo to Yokohama. It has comparability, in the cars, with an airplane and the services of an airplane, and I think in some ways is much better than an airplane. The roadbed, of course, is extremely expensive.

I talked to the president of the Japanese Railway. He said it is very expensive, but it is paying off. He said it goes over 300 miles in 3 hours and brings passengers right into the heart of the city, and he said this is really attractive.

I asked him this question, and I am throwing it out here now to get your reaction—I notice you say you desire to put a bridge for mass transit, mass transportation, over Lake Washington. Are we approaching this in the wrong concept by putting it overhead or over a surface and not under a surface?

Mr. BRAMAN. I think I could answer without a question of doubt in my own mind, that it would be much better, if it appeared to be at all feasible, to start out with a tube construction. On the other hand, from the angle of feasibility, of any possibility of accomplishment, this would so increase the cost and complicate the program that I am afraid that I would find it difficult to support that as part of our initial program. It certainly can come along. There is nothing we are talking about that would change that.

The bridge we are talking about is going to be built anyway. It is part of the State of Washington's program, and as you may know, or may not, we have one floating bridge which has been there for many years which became a free bridge much earlier than anticipated because of traffic, and then of course it became glutted to the point where it was almost a barrier rather than a help in moving the people across the lake.

Since that time, a second bridge has been built, floating bridge, and this one, still bearing a toll of 35 cents a car, but in spite of the fact that it is in competition with the free bridge just 10 miles away down the lake, it, too, is reaching its capability and it is starting to pay off much faster than anticipated. But neither of these structures were