$102,435,000, and which, from the carrier's point of view, is a better line than the one which must be abandoned because of the erection of Libby Dam.

The new line of railroad is a better line because it is a shorter line. Its construction enables the carrier to save money on fuel and maintenance. It also enables the carrier to save money on the wages it now pays its employees. The latter saving, of course, is made at the direct expense of the employees involved.

H.R. 16910 recognizes the direct adverse effects which the Flood Control Act of 1950 will visit upon employees of the Great Northern who will lose an average of $3.32 every time they make the run between Whitefish and Troy, Mont., over the new track. To those employees who work this run once a day, every day of the year, it would mean a loss of $1,211.80 in annual income. To those who average 5 days a week over this run it would mean a loss of $830 in annual income.

It seems to us that the vast expenditure of funds made to protect the railroad and the public which it serves against adverse effects as a result of the Libby Dam project could be increased by a relatively insignificant amount to protect the employees of the railroad from serious adverse effects. Indeed, the cost to the Government of protecting the employees against the adverse effects of this project would probably amount to less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the entire project and certainly no more than 1 percent of that cost.

H.R. 16910 would authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay to each employee who was an operating employee of the Great Northern on the date the new line was placed in service and who prior to that time had been regularly assigned to runs on the line which was abandoned, an amount of money which would be equal to the difference between the wages the employee would have earned over the old line and those which he earns over the new line. The Secretary is to pay these amounts at appropriate intervals, but not less than quarterly.

I think the committee and the Congress should know what we believe to be the absolute maximum amount which the Secretary of the Army would pay to adversely affected employees should H.R. 16910 become the law. At the present time there are operating over this trackage, 7 days a week, two passenger trains in each direction and five freight trains in each direction. The crews of the passenger trains consist of four engineers, four firemen, four baggagemen, four conductors, and eight brakemen. The crews of the freight trains consist of 12 engineers, one fireman, 10 conductors, and 20 brakemen. The total numbers of employees by category are 16 engineers, five firemen, 14 conductors, six baggagemen, and 28 brakemen for a total of 69 employees. If we consider the loss to each man as $3.32 per day, the maximum cost to the Secretary of the Army would be $83,614.20 per year. If this figure is multiplied by 30 years, the total maximum cost to the Secretary over that period of time would be $2,508,426. It is most doubtful that the money paid to the employees would reach this figure because of the rate of attrition of these employees through death, retirement, resignation, and so forth.

H.R. 16910 is directed toward protecting the man, not the job. Therefore, although 69 jobs may remain on this line for 30 years, the only employees entitled to the benefits of this bill would be those employees