**A**

In Europe, trains commonly run from city to city at over 150 miles per hour. In the United States, the Acela train, which is now our fastest, is designed to go up to 150 miles per hour, but it usually travels at about 80 miles per hour. A train ride on an Acela costs twice as much as it would on a regular train, and Acela stop only at particular cities between New York City and Washington, DC. Even so, Acela trains are profitable (能盈利的), and many people enjoy the safe, speedy rides. Unfortunately, high-speed trains are not a top priority (优先考虑的事项) in the United States. Although more Acela-type systems would be a clear solution to deal with pollution and traffic problems, these systems are not going to appear all over the country anytime soon.

In the United States, the costs of high-speed rail systems are extremely high. Building a system that would connect major cities in California alone is expected to cost more than 70 billion dollars. Without enough money, legislators (立法者) do not want to spend so much money on a project that may not be completed for more than a decade. On top of that, the distances between major large cities in the United States are much greater than between cities across Europe. While a high-speed system might make sense to connect Dallas and Houston, it would be very costly and difficult to build between cities that are over 1,000 miles apart.

However, even if the United States used high-speed rail systems only in some areas, there would still be immediate benefits. If high-speed rail systems were built in California and the popular Northeast corridor (走廊), more than one million construction jobs would be created. In the long run, because people would use the trains instead of driving or flying, the country could save millions of dollars on oil costs and greatly reduce carbon dioxide emissions (排放).

**1. Why are there so few high-speed rail systems in the United States?**

A. They cost train travellers more to ride. B. They cause traffic problems.

C. They are very costly to build. D. They do not always travel at top speed.

**2. Legislators are against high-speed rail systems, because they would \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.**

A. take much time and money B. speed up carbon dioxide emissions

C. decrease the use of cars and planes D. cause more job loss

**3. Why does the author include information about European high-speed rail systems?**

A. To prove how similar the United States and Europe are.

B. To show it is possible to build efficient rail systems in the US.

C. To tell readers that trains move too fast to be safe.

D. To persuade readers to ride European trains.

**4. What evidence from the text supports the building of a high-speed rail system?**

A. It would create many job opportunities. B. It would save travelers a lot of time.

C. It would take a small amount of time. D. It would provide more choices for travelers.