

it is not a question of competition taking over. There is no more rail passenger service.

And, so, what I want to ask you is: If the Government has (1) granted to these railroads originally a financial base under the every-other-section-of-land rule and (2) has protected them in a monopoly situation by saying no one else can go in and run up and down those rails which they have. In view of this isn't there some requirement to protect the public interest that this committee must be cognizant of so we should say to that company, "All right, now having been given these things and protecting you as we are, you must provide something in the way of service"?

Now, what is your reply to that?

Mr. LANG. I think that the notion that the railroads have been granted a monopoly in the sense that that monopoly continues to exist has long since become an outmoded notion.

I do not think that something less than 2 percent of the total intercity rail or intercity passenger travel in the country, which is all that the railroads now have, constitutes in any sense a monopoly, and I do not think that 24 percent of the total intercity freight dollar, which is all the railroads now have, constitutes any kind of a monopoly either.

Mr. ADAMS. All right. Now, let me ask you this:

We have, through the merger situation, and I can take the northern lines because I happen to be more familiar with that than the others. In the case of the northern lines, by the time the discontinuance proceedings are over for a number of the lines and a merger is completed, the rail service, basically, in those areas, will be available only from one person. You can say there is intermodel competition, and you can say this provides competition, and there is no problem, but certain types of commodities have to be carried at the present time by rail, particularly in the agricultural States. Now, we grant a monopoly on that to the rail carrier for those commodities all traffic has to run over his lines.

What I am asking you is: In return for doing that, can the people or the Government say "We want some kind of minimum service to carry people who either do not drive, cannot afford to get on a jet, or feel that the traffic congestion situations of going in and out of Chicago, in and out of the city of Seattle on a bus is something they do not want to face?"

Mr. LANG. This is a question, Mr. Adams, to which we do not have a clear-cut answer. In fact, it is a question in our view to which a study such as that proposed here would have to address itself.

Are there in fact types of trips and travelers whose needs can only be adequately met by rail service, something along the lines as we have known it, or, as a practical matter, can all people find an alternative which is acceptable?

This is a question which a study would have to try to answer.

Mr. ADAMS. All right.

Now, the ICC presentation indicates that in August of 1958 there were 1,448 intercity trains. In May of 1968, there were 590 left.

It is down someplace to only a third to a half are left and there are 43 more pending, and, incidently, in these figures you never crank in