

of the institute embraces all facets of the industry—operating and planning organizations, manufacturers and suppliers, and consulting engineering firms. However, the institute's board of directors, as the policymaking body, consists entirely of representatives of the following operating and planning organizations: Bi-State Transit System (St. Louis), Chicago Transit Authority, Cleveland Transit System, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (Boston), Montreal Transportation Commission, New York City Transit Authority, Port Authority of Allegheny County (Pittsburgh), San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Toronto Transit Commission.

First, as a representative of the rapid transit industry, I would like to express our appreciation for the recognition that Congress has given to the need for financial assistance to mass transit improvements through the enactment of Mass Transportation Acts of 1962 and 1964.

The position of our industry long has been that metropolitan areas must have a balanced approach to their transportation problems. Obviously, the automobile is here to stay. It is performing and will continue to perform an important function in fulfilling the overall transportation needs of the community. At the same time, however, I am sure we all realize that in our congested and growing urban areas the automobile alone cannot possibly perform the total transportation job. This is particularly true with regard to moving large numbers of people to and from the central business district in the peak hours of travel. The truth of the matter is that unless modern transit facilities, particularly rapid transit facilities in large areas, are provided along with similar urban highway improvements, there is little or no hope of maintaining prosperous and growing central business districts.

Our problem in the post-World War II years was that for the most part, this importance or need for public transportation was not recognized. To further complicate matters, funds were readily available for highway construction while little if any such assistance was available for transit.

Now that Congress is being asked to continue this assistance, you might very well inquire about what has been accomplished with the assistance previously authorized. I think, Congressman, you asked that question.

Many cities throughout the country, grateful for this action on the part of the Federal Government, have taken immediate steps to avail themselves of this much needed assistance. Time would not permit a complete review of the benefits derived by the various rapid transit systems. We would like, however, to cite a few examples which are typical.

1. Cleveland: In Cleveland, Federal assistance now is making possible the construction, for the first time in the United States, of a rail rapid transit facility connecting a major airport with the downtown business district. Some local funds had been available for this extension for a number of years. However, these local funds were grossly insufficient to carry out the construction so the project lay dormant until Federal assistance became available.

2. New York City: I think Mr. Gilhooley explained that and I need not explain that. They bought 200 new cars which otherwise would not have been available to them.