

built, nor was the freeway, with any contemplation whatever for any support to rapid transit, whether it became just for buses or anything else.

The third bridge will be parallel to the first bridge and it is going to be built anyway.

The question is: Should we have a bridge constructed so that it would take the impact of 80-mile-an-hour trains, for example, running either on rubber tires or concrete strips or rails or what have you—depending on what the latest technological advance would be, or should the bridge be constructed again as were the first two, strictly to serve the automobile? And we are sure that we can get this. We are quite confident we can get this decision made, that the bridge will be constructed to provide right-of-way, because if, by any chance, it cannot be used by us this will become merely two more lanes reversible—two more lanes reversible for the automobile to use. So, at no point would there be a waste here, if at some future time the combined traffic of automobiles and rapid transit required a new right-of-way. The tunnel could be built, and the old construction could still serve its purpose and be economically proper for the use of rubber-tired vehicles.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you.

Mrs. Dwyer?

Mrs. DWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Section 301 of H.R. 12946 has the administration proposal for mass transit. Are you familiar with that section?

Mr. BRAMAN. Yes.

Mrs. DWYER. A bill has been introduced by our colleague, Congressman Widnall. It is a simple bill which would increase the amount from \$150 to \$175 million, starting in 1968. Would you approve of this amendment to the bill of increasing the amount?

Mr. BRAMAN. I certainly would. In fact, I think it is a most important amendment, and I think Congressman Widnall is certainly right on track.

In the first place, assuming that we get Mr. Adams' amendment, and plans do develop at a little faster pace than they are now, and we get to the point where the demand for this support for construction becomes a real thing, and then the amount of money that is currently funded, or the increase, probably will not be adequate but certainly it will be an improvement. The one thing that I see that is a tremendous improvement in Mr. Widnall's proposal is that it becomes a recurring appropriation rather than one that has to be battled out at some level every year which makes it impossible to advance plans with any degree of certainty.

Mrs. DWYER. Mass transit is somewhat apart from other housing problems. It may even be more apart if we get a Department of Transportation. Would you favor passing, as was done in 1964, a separate mass transit bill?

Mr. BRAMAN. This certainly would be desirable. I think it is a great idea. I am not prepared to know what complications would lie behind that kind of bill here in the National Congress. Assuming that there are no serious complications, I would favor such enactment, yes, but I think this is something that I would have to leave the determination to those of you who are face to face with the problem.