

it would require that where a train is operated by more than one railroad, and one railroad files a notice to discontinue that train, that the notice must be posted at the depots and facilities and so on of all of the railroads participating in the operation of that train.

Now, while we appreciate the purpose of this provision in attempting to give more widespread notice to a proposed discontinuance, we do think it raises certain serious and difficult problems. The carrier has no control over the property of the other carrier regardless of whether the train happens to be a joint operation. What I am trying to say is that they have no way of forcing access to the properties of the other carrier. They have no way of policing the posting on the property of the other carrier. We can envision difficulties in complying 100 percent with this kind of a provision. If it is thought that the present notice ought to be a little more widespread, in the instance that I have described, then we think serious consideration should be given to not making such posting an absolute requirement but that some terms qualifying the posting requirement should be included.

There are two other amendments that H.R. 18212 would make. First, an amendment would make it clear that the train operating and to which the law applies, is a passenger train. Next, an amendment would make it clear that the Commission had jurisdiction over that passenger train operating from a point in the United States to a point in a foreign country. And the last amendment that would be made by H.R. 18212 is a provision that having posted notice and filed the notice with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroad could not discontinue the train during that notice period. In other words, they would have to continue to operate the train until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. Further, that if the train were taken off by the carrier prior to the expiration of that notice period, the Commission could order its immediate reinstatement and operation.

Summarizing with respect to H.R. 18212, we feel that no substantial case has been made to your committee justifying the amendments proposed by this bill. We are opposed to section 1 of H.R. 18212, and section 3. As far as the study that is called for by H.R. 18212, as Mr. Goodfellow has stated, we have no objections to such a study, and if such a study is made it would be our intention to cooperate fully.

We do feel, and I think Mr. Watson pointed out yesterday, the bill itself calls for the study to be made by the Department of Transportation and other interested Government agencies, while we feel that the study should include the cooperation, and as a part of the study the modes of transportation, rail, highway, and air, and so on should be an integral part of any such study.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that completes my statement in the main. I have one or two comments I would like to make about the presentation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

They had a map which in substance showed the differences between the existing passenger train service in 1958, versus 1968, and they mentioned cities. The map itself showed only railroads. It didn't show, for instance, scheduled airlines. It didn't show how many additional flights you have between these points. It didn't show the interstate highway system or new or improved highways that have become available, and we also feel that there are other statistical data that would have to be considered in looking at any map and simply saying, well,