U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, ALAN S. BOYD, BEFORE THE SOUTH BEND TRANSPORTATION CLUB, IN SOUTH BEND, INDIANA, MORRIS INN, ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1968, 12:30 P. M.

You may as well know I'm having trouble with my watch today.

It has an alarm mechanism that usually sounds off with a very satisfying buzz at any given hour. But from the minute we crossed the Indiana border this morning, all it has done is whimper.

Indiana has been a unique experience for me in another respect. I've walked into places and found my picture turned to the wall. But this is the first time I've ever flown into a place and found the clocks turned to the wall.

Nevertheless, I am delighted to be here.

I am pleased, also, to share this headtable with John Brademas.

Not only is he one of the best men in Congress, but we have a mutual interest in education. Of course, we are interested in different phases of it. He's primarily concerned with teaching. And the Department is primarily interested in learning.

What we are trying to learn is how to take a system as complicated as the transportation system of the United States and make it run better.

And we believe it is important to make it run more smoothly; to make it safer; to make it move cargo from factory to consumer more efficiently; because nothing in America is more pervasive than transportation.

You can no more fight a war without it than you can mail a postcard.

The American family of four with an income of $10,000 spends more on transportation than on anything else except food. Transportation costs that family more than housing, more than taxes, more than clothing, more than the education of its children.

And the difficulties we encounter in this system range all the way from an empty gas tank to a full airport terminal - so do the solutions to those difficulties. The final payment on the family car is one solution. So is an apartment in the building where you work. So - perhaps the best solution of all for middle-aged men - is a bicycle.

Regardless of your perspective, America's transportation system is as complicated as the people who use it. It is also enormous.

It represents an investment of some $500 billion. It meets the needs of 200 million people. It accounts for one of every six dollars in the economy; provides jobs for nine-million people; and unites a continent.

Yet, the increasing demands on this system already strain its capacity in some areas and the growth to come - compounded by the concentration of that growth - could trun the system into a drag on the economy.

Take the year 1975 as a yardstick of growth - bearing in mind that it is not a long time; just enough for a boy who is in the sixth grade today to be entering Notre Dame as a freshman.

By then, the number of private aircraft will have nearly doubled. Commercial air travel will have tripled. Automobile traffic will be up 40 percent. Railroads, which now haul 750 billion ton-miles a year will, by then, be hauling one trillion ton-miles. Trucks that now carry 400 billion ton-miles will be carrying 50 percent more.

In fact, if the demand for transportation continues to match America's economic growth, we will have to double in less than two decades the capacity of a system that has taken the lifetime of a nation to build.

President Johnson and the 89th Congress read the danger signals in these growth figures two years ago.

From that reading, came the Department.

In his message asking for the creation of the Department, President Johnson said - in effect - that ours is the best transportation system in the world but it is not good enough.

It is not good enough when it kills as many people as it does; when highways tear up landscape that can never be replaced; when it takes as long to drive from some airports into some cities as it does to fly from airport to airport; and - above all - when the transportation network of the nation continues to operate as an uncoordinated, disjointed collection of roads, canals, rails, airports, piers and pipelines rather than as a genuine system.

It is not good enough, he said, when people are obligated to conform to the system rather than the other way around.

And, in a sense, our job is to make the system conform more closely to the needs of people.

In our efforts to carry out the mandate of the President and the Congress, we are working on two levels and in two time spans.

We are trying to take a long look into the future, recognizing that in this age of accelerating change what we do in 1968 and 1969 will, in large measure, shape the system we will have in 1975 or 1985.

At the same time, we are working to improve the system as it exists today - to make it better serve the needs of the 1960's and to make it serve as a better foundation on which to build for the 1980's.

From our immediate efforts have come the nation's first automobile and highway safety programs; research on high-speed ground systems; efforts to control air pollution and noise; the start of an investigation of automobile insurance; programs to restore fast and attractive public transportation to the cities; the country's first gas pipeline safety program; and the beginnings of better systems to preserve the nation's outstanding air safety record.

And in this same category are the beginnings of an overall effort to deal with the impact of transportation on the environment.

With more than two-thirds of all Americans now living in and near cities, the time is behind us when we could consider a transportation system a success because of its speed alone. It can only be successful now if it is efficient in social terms, as well; if it does its job without disrupting the landscape; polluting the air and generally disturbing the peace.

Transportation has its greatest impact on the greatest numbers of people in and around cities. Federal highway programs provide substantial funds to state and local governments for some 54,000 miles of primary, secondary and interstate highways in urban areas -- plus another 856,000 miles in rural areas.

These roads are the backbone of most urban transportation systems. Like any backbone, they are subject to occasional aches and pains.

Our approach to the problem of transportation in the cities has been based on three assumptions:

First, that we look at highways or rapid transit systems or any other mode of transportation not as separate, self-contained operations leading lives of their own, but as parts of a total system that serves the needs of people.

Second, that we look at urban transportation in terms of the whole city and the people who live in it; in terms of the human and physical environment in which the transportation operates; and in terms of the citizens whose lives it can as easily disrupt as it can enhance.

Third, that we must look to the cities themselves to tell us what their needs are -- for no city is exactly like another; and a given city's transportation system must depend on what kind of community it is now and what its people want it to be in the years ahead.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 is a reflection of this basic philosophy.

In city after city, we have seen that highways - unless they are carefully planned - can ruin neighborhoods, add to pollution, absorb park land and promote congestion instead of relieving it.

The new highway act is an historic attempt to prevent these harmful fall-out effects of highways and at the same time respond to the need for more and better streets and highways.

As President Johnson said when he signed the measure into law, it is "in many respects the most important highway authorization bill since the start of the Interestate Program over a decade ago."

Under this new act:

--We can move ahead to complete the Interstate Highway System.

--As we do so, families - particularly the poor - who are displaced from their homes by highway projects - will receive the help they need to find and move into decent dwellings.

--We can authorize highway departments to buy rights-of-way in advance to help assure better planned, less expensive routes that cause a minimum of disruption.

--We can provide up to $250 million a year in matching funds for cities to improve their traffic flows and cut congestion without investing in major new road building.

--We can provide financial help for the construction of fringe parking facilities that will tie in with public transportation and - again - cut congestion in crowded business districts.

--Highway planners will be required to consider social and environmental factors in determining the location of urban highways.

--And there will be more effective guarantees of equal employment opportunity in the highway construction industry.

As one step toward practicing what we preach about dealing with the transportation of a city as one system, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration has recently been transferred to the Department of Transportation.

With all urban transportation now under one roof, we are in a better position to blend together the various ingredients of urban transportation and to coordinate them with the other elements of the national system.

One way to promote this blending process is to change the ground rules for Federal aid to cities.

Mayors and managers of America's cities now have no real choice when it comes to meeting the transportation needs of their people.

There is a choice on paper, of course.

A state can take Federal funds for Interstate highway construction at a ratio of 90 cents from Washington for every ten cents of its own. But if a mayor wants Federal help for public transportation, he must put up 33 cents toward every dollar and for not very many dollars at that. For a hard-pressed community leader whose people need transportation now, that is no choice at all.

We hope to increase the funds available for public transportation substantially so that cities will have real alternatives when they start drawing plans for their transportation systems.

Other actions we are taking today will have a major impact on the shape of the transportation system of the future.

You can get some idea of what that future is like by examining some 400 projects of research and demonstration that we have initiated during the past 18 months.

One of our highest priorities has gone to safety programs in the air, on the rails and on the highways.

For the first time in our history, this Administration has declared that 53,000 traffic deaths a year constitute a national emergency and it has acted to deal with it.

Safety devices which are required on new automobiles - devices such as pop-out windshields, collapsible steering wheels, stronger tires, and seat and shoulder harnesses - are already saving lives.

And while I am at it, let me put in a plug for the seat belt and shoulder strap. They are standard equipment in 1968 cars, as you know. In Sweden, they did a survey of some 9,600 traffic accidents in which all of the people in the cars were wearing both seat and harness equipment. Nobody died in any of those accidents. And yet one dealer told us recently that a man drove back to the shop in his new car with the straps dangling and said: "You'd better take this spaghetti out of here before somebody gets hurt."

I will not press the issue. But it is worth thinking about.

We are committed to a full-scale study of automobile insurance and to the design of three prototype safety test cars and to more readable road signs and signals.

Transportation between cities is another area to which we are giving a great deal of attention.

Our projections of transportation trends show that we must anticipate a huge additional amount of air traffic in the years immediately ahead. It will increase at its greatest rate in those corridors which are already the most heavily congested.

So we are working on a major overhaul in air traffic control policies and techniques.

This overhaul will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. To help finance this expansion, we are now proposing that aviation assume a larger share of this cost as payment for the special benefits it is receiving.

At present, through passenger ticket tax, the airlines are paying about 85 percent of their share of the airway costs that can be allocated to them. We are urging that the ticket tax be increased and another tax be levied on air freight. With these new taxes, the air carriers would be paying all of their airway costs.

General aviation pays a minimal fuel tax. But funds from this tax pay only 4 1/2 percent of the total costs of the airways services provided general aviation. This is not equitable. We are proposing to increase this fuel tax.

Even with this increase, general aviation will still be paying only 20 percent of its share of the costs of the services it receives.

The costs of the third user of the airways - the military and other government aircraft - are rightfully paid out of general government funds.

We feel the taxes we are proposing to the Congress are just and equitable. But we have an open mind to other proposals and suggestions. Form is not the problem, but substance is. Each element of aviation should bear its share of the costs of the services it receives. The acceptance of this fact is what we seek.

At the same time, we are giving increasing attention to Vertical Take-Off and Landing and Short Take-Off and Landing aircraft. Nearly 80 percent of all commercial flights are made between cities less than 500 miles apart. This is not really an efficient distance for many of today's jetliners - let alone for tomorrow's jumbo jets.

We have several studies underway to determine the role that STOL's and VTOL's have in linking the scattered medium-sized cities that are becoming the distinguishing features of America's metropolitan regions.

While travel continues to increase in crowded corridors, there is every reason to believe that high-speed ground transportation will increase in importance.

Next Monday, we will take delivery of two trains powered by the same kinds of engines that provide thrust for jet airliners.

The trains - built by United Aircraft and capable of speeds up to 170 miles an hour - will be placed in service between Boston and New York for two years to test whether faster, more modern trains can revive rail passenger service.

We hope they will. We see the high-speed train as a good alternative to air travel over intermediate distances which would help relieve airport congestion in major cities.

We see it, for example, as a possibility for runs between Chicago and Detroit and Detroit and Cleveland.

All of our programs of the past and our proposals for the future have - as their common goal - the notion that transportation is a system designed to serve people and the society in which they live.

Transportation is a means, not an end. And our job - as we see it - is to help make the transportation system of this country more and more a means; not just for moving vehicles and goods and bodies from one place to another, but for helping secure a better life for people.

Thank you.

# # # # # # #