

the merger effect which may have even a greater debilitating effect on the passenger service.

What we are saying if I understand it is that if something is not done to provide a minimum service, while you are making the study in the next 2 years, and there will not be any passenger service left. Don't you think maybe we ought to have a 40-percent floor, because 40 percent of the remaining third gets you down to a pretty small amount.

Mr. LANG. I would refer back to a couple of points that have already been made, both by myself and by the Commission: First, by preserving today's kind of passenger service seems unlikely to bring about the development of the kind of rail passenger service that can meet some kind of market demand that is not being met equally as well or better by competing modes of transportation.

The second thing which I would say—and this was the thrust of the latter part of my testimony—is that if we continue to force the railroads to run deficit operations, given at the high value freight which has been the source of the money, which in the past has made it possible for them to run deficit operations in freight and passenger, given that this high value traffic has been siphoned away to competing modes of freight transportation, we are going to end up with a bunch of railroads that are flat broke which, sooner or later, if things continue the way they are going now, the Federal Government is going to have to buy up and operate, and I do not think that either the present administration nor the Congress is ready to contemplate that kind of draconian measure at this point.

Mr. ADAMS. All right. Now, if we take your assumption on that we, of course, get into the same situation that you are facing, and I am 180 degrees around from you on that, because I support that part of the proposition that says we have to do something with the commuter and intercity transportation. The problem we have found is that when you get down to the last train or close to it, the service becomes so abominable that nobody wants to ride it.

In other words, if you end up with a train that runs only at very bad hours and the food is bad or nonexistent, sleeping facilities are old and very much out of date, and the whole level has gone down to a point where nobody wants to ride it, then you will of course have no passengers. I understand what is being proposed here is to prevent that from happening, saying with regard to the last trains, the ICC can do what I felt they always should have been able to do, which is to maintain, under the certificate of public convenience and necessity concept, minimum standards on that train. What is your position on that? Should they be able to do that, so that if there is only one passenger train left you do not get an automatic continuing passenger dropoff of trains by forcing people off of the train because it is so bad?

Mr. LANG. As I stated, in my statement, Mr. Adams, we do not oppose that provision in H.R. 18212. We think it makes sense.

Mr. ADAMS. That provision is not going to do you any good though, if there is not anything left, is it?

Mr. LANG. No, sir, as there is not in many places now.

Mr. ADAMS. What I am trying to find out from you is whether we ought to make an effort to maintain something until we can get something better, and I gather from your testimony that your feeling