

Mr. KEITH. When were these two meetings in which you were involved?

Secretary BOYD. I do not remember. They have been since I was appointed Secretary.

Mr. KEITH. In the last 5 weeks?

Secretary BOYD. No. I was appointed Secretary on January 16, 1967. The Department began to function on April 1.

Mr. KEITH. There has been some discussion here about the alternative shipping that was available because of foreign flags using our ports. Is there not a parallel, to some extent, in this particular situation, in that we do have trucklines and we do have railroads where there are alternative routes? In those areas where there are competing trucklines, waterways, or parallel routes, should there not be some recognition of their right to continue in operation rather than having this legislation apply across the board?

Secretary BOYD. I know of no alternative routes available by rail if there is a nationwide rail strike.

Mr. KEITH. No parallel lines?

Secretary BOYD. Not to my knowledge. By definition, I would think that a nationwide rail strike would put all rail lines out of business. In my testimony on page 5, at the bottom of the page, my statement was that estimates of excess capacity available from other modes place the maximum divertible amount of traffic at 10 percent of the normal rail volume, and that only after extensive adjustment in traffic patterns achieved over a number of weeks.

Even this low figure does not account for the specialized handling requirements of much of the traffic normally carried by rail.

Mr. KEITH. Are there any alternative approaches to this problem that you personally think are worthy of this committee's consideration if the administration fails to come up with a proposal?

Secretary BOYD. I know of none.

Mr. KEITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I apologize for being delayed. I read over your testimony very carefully, and I think your statement is an excellent one. I think we sometimes get off base in forgetting the public interest.

As I read your statement, I think you have tried to stress the public interest in this whole matter.

Secretary BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. And I am concerned about it, of course, as a Member of Congress. Of course, we do want to protect the collective bargaining where we can, but the public interest must prevail.

We have gone into the matter of how you would set priorities of essential goods, if it were decided to do nothing but just let them move essential goods. I would think you could get into rather prolonged negotiations about what might be essential to a community. A man who is going to be put out of a job because they can't get coal for a manufacturing plant might feel he is pretty vitally affected and would feel it were an emergency.

I would think then we could get into a discussion and we would have to have an emergency board to get them together on that and