

established legislative procedures. We have begun our analysis of these recommendations and we will provide our views to the Committee within the near future.

The ICC also recommended that the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, study the existing and future potential for intercity rail passenger service. We believe such a study would be within the public interest and we would welcome the responsibility for its conduct. It would supplement the studies which we already have undertaken, including the highspeed ground demonstration efforts which are well underway.

But we believe that it is important that the Congress provide the Department with the resources to discharge this responsibility. The study will require both staff and money far beyond what is now available to us through the normal appropriation process. This is particularly true in light of the passage of the Revenue and Expenditure Act of 1968 which will place even tighter restraints on the Department's capacity to undertake new tasks.

We would, therefore, urge that if the Committee plans to initiate legislation which would direct the Department to undertake such a study, it would include within that measure sufficient funds to enable us to discharge the task. We also urge that Congress provide the Secretary with the power to compel the appearance of witnesses and the production of documents. If you wish, we will be pleased to provide you with a recommendation of the funds required to meet these new responsibilities.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. ROBSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. BEATTIE. This letter appears to state a policy somewhat contrary to the position expressed by Mr. Lang yesterday as to the Department's willingness to undertake a study.

Mr. WATSON. I don't know what it contains, but I notice that it is dated July 27, 1968.

Mr. BEATTIE. The date should be June 27. That was the date it was received by the Senate Commerce Committee, which was the day, as I recall, when the Subcommittee on Transportation in the Senate passed out a number of passenger train discontinuance bills which contained all the essential features of the bill before the committee today, plus some additional resolutions and bills, all of which are designed to meet this problem we are talking about.

Mr. WATSON. Thank you. Just a couple of questions now. You recommend two amendments. First, the protective conditions for employees who may be adversely affected by discontinuance of these passenger trains. What has been your experience in the past as to the effect upon employees, if they have been absorbed in other areas of the railway operation.

Mr. BEATTIE. The fact of the matter is that approximately 60 percent of the employees presently directly engaged in railroad passenger service are covered by one or another form of employee protection agreements arising from mergers of railroads or from results of Public Law 88-108, the operating employees dispute. One form or another of agreement covers some 60 percent of the employees presently engaged in passenger train service.

On the other hand, the impact hits in different ways in different places. For example, when the Santa Fe Railroad discontinued some passenger trains a short while back—I never followed up to check this report—but the report I had came from a railroad official. The Santa Fe operated almost complete passenger train service over one of its lines. It had little or no freight service. And when they discontinued those trains and on this railroad there is no employee protection