

But no effort has ever been made to determine the type of balanced transportation requirements existing in this Nation.

Shouldn't we make such an effort before permitting the further dismantling of an important segment of transportation?

Mr. TIERNEY. I might say, Mr. Moss, the Commission has recommended in the past, as we have indicated, a study to look at the overall passenger situation, with the objective of determining what essential passenger service is needed in the United States for the next 10, 15, or 20 years.

This is something that has been recommended and I think it would be necessary for Congress to establish a policy to that effect, and the study would be an extensive one and take some funding.

You may find areas where 10 or 15 years from now we could conceivably project that they would support rail service. But in the interim, you have the problem of how is it going to be supported.

On the other side of the coin, I am sure there are passenger trains which probably are not essential. I think an opportunity should be given in those cases for permitting discontinuances if they are not essential; that is, if they are big losers and are not required by the public.

Mr. Moss. Of course, big losers raises a very interesting question. I have watched the dismantling of the transportation of the Southern Pacific Lines in my State of California. It has followed a very interesting pattern. Schedules become far less convenient to travelers between points than they were previously.

I recall when it was quite a pleasant experience to board the train and go from Sacramento to San Francisco. You arrived there in time to do some shopping and then return in the evening.

Then the schedules were rearranged and no rational person would leave at the hour the train was scheduled to depart, and the hopes of getting back at a reasonable hour vanished.

So you were confined either to a Greyhound bus or an airplane, or your private automobile.

But I think it is quite clear now, almost at the end of the highway construction program, which was authorized back in 1958, with probably \$70 billion to \$100 billion being spent on highways, that we have not kept pace with the demands for highway construction, and that the needs of transportation in this Nation cannot be met solely by constructing ever more highways or freeways.

We are starting already, we have authorized projects, pilot projects, in this committee, between highly populated areas of the Nation, in an effort to reestablish railroad surface transportation.

I wager it will not be too many years we will have requests of the Congress to spend public moneys to reestablish train service to cover greater areas of the Nation.

I think the study should be made before we have completely dismantled. We are a long way down the road. I was a member of this committee when I opposed the adoption of 13a. There weren't very many who did.

But I think we moved too far, too fast, with very little information, and very, very little regard for the public interest, the public need, for an adequate system of transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kuykendall?

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I want to welcome you, Mr. Chairman, to the committee.