

the program structured as I have suggested, we in New York would have been able to undertake a subway expansion program more than a quarter of a billion dollars on a 50-50 matching grant basis. Undoubtedly, we would have embarked already on the vital and necessary extensions to northern, central, and southern Queens, and, perhaps, the building of a new East Side line from the Battery to the Bronx to alleviate our terribly overcrowded Lexington Avenue line. I am certain that the story would be similarly striking and spectacular in every other urban center of the Nation. I, therefore, urge you, gentlemen and Mrs. Dwyer, to think in terms of that kind of financing and to think in terms of the commitment of funds to support the debt service of a capital investment rather than the amount to be used in the investment itself.

I have cited mainly the benefits to the New York subway because that is where our major problems are; but in most of our cities mass transit means bus systems. I do not think these need be the bus we know today. I think we have the technological ability to produce a more comfortable and quieter vehicle with turbine engines that will not pollute the air. What is needed to produce this in addition to the stick of public insistence and the carrot of a large market, is the willingness on the part of the large manufacturers of buses, and, in particular, General Motors, drastically to step up its research and development effort for the gas turbine engine.

In any event, whatever surface vehicle ultimately is produced, it is 20 to 30 times more economical in its use of space than the private car. And space is one of the most valuable of our city's assets.

In the larger cities, not only the giants, but those of over half a million population—our Seattles, Pittsburghs, Atlantas, and Washingtons—we need an off-the-street transit system. In these cities space on the street surface has become so valuable, and so crowded that we must supplement the street system by an efficient mass carrier that no longer requires the use of the streets—modern subways and the better systems we will develop in the future.

The essential needed ingredient to produce this balanced transportation system to revive our cities is money. The cities are at or near the end of their resources. Federal help is needed, and the Congress had recognized the principle in the assistance it has already made available.

Your committee has before you for consideration the President's demonstration cities program, and the proposed Urban Development Act, H.R. 12946, Mr. Patman, and H.R. 12939, Mr. Barrett, particularly title III dealing with urban mass transportation.

Title III would amend section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964 to provide an additional authorization of \$95 million for fiscal year 1968. It would also amend section 6(b) to extend the annual authorization of \$10 million for research, development, and demonstration projects.

I am happy to vigorously support the principle exemplified by these bills, and the bill just introduced by Representative Widnall, which makes mass transit aid a permanent Federal program, but I submit that only the surface of the transportation problems of our cities will be scratched by the amounts authorized by these bills, unless they adopt the financing method I propose.