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Mr. Chairman:

First, I would like to express to you and the Members of the Board my appreciation for giving me the opportunity to appear before you this morning and express the views of the Montana Congressional Delegation on the need for improvement in Montana's air service.

I do not intend to go into great detail, but I feel that before the Board renders its decision, it should give further consideration to several factors.

One, there are a number of circumstances which have changed since the Examiner's report in this case which I shall discuss later in my remarks.

Two, the Board has enunciated new policy concerning local service which the Examiner did not have fully before him throughout his consideration of this case. I feel, therefore, that you gentlemen should consider the request of Montana's communities for service in the light of your recent decisions--most notably the "Seven States Case."

Briefly, the Examiner's report does not take away any service from Montana, nor does it give Montana any additional service. We in Montana have struggled for many years for additional air service merely to receive an Examiner's initial decision which maintains the status quo. Frankly, I wonder if his decision doesn't make the title of this proceeding, the "Montana Local Service Case" something of a misnomer. Very seriously, the prospect of deferring our urgent needs for air service for five years or so--until this Board can again get around to examining our requirements--is depressing to the extreme.

As you know, the people in my State for many years felt a great need to get airline service along what we call the "Hi Line," the northern region of
the State. It was a great disappointment to us when the Examiner did not recommend that such service be inaugurated.

I feel that the Examiner did not give sufficient consideration to the isolation problem in the Montana Local Air Service case as was done in the Seven States Case. In going over the decision of the Seven States Case, it would appear that the standards which were applied with respect to "unusual circumstances, such as extreme isolation or national defense" were not taken into consideration in the Examiner's recommendation on Montana's case, except to indicate that surface transportation is available.

The communities along the Hi Line are located at the extreme northern border of our State and they are separated by great distance from such major metropolitan areas such as Minneapolis, Spokane and Seattle.

There is a great deal of common interest between these cities and the communities of Montana, and, of course, while we do have three excellent railroads crossing the State, the people's needs can no longer be served by surface transportation alone.

For example, in case of an emergency, people living in cities like Glasgow, Havre and Shelby have no air service at all, and should someone have to be evacuated due to illness, they have to charter a plane, and many times even these are unavailable. I need not tell you how precious time is under such circumstances.

In view of the Examiner's reliance on the availability of surface transportation, I would like to point out that there is considerable speculation that the transcontinental railroads serving Montana may consolidate as a necessary economy measure and this would undoubtedly mean considerable curtailment of service to Montana communities if put into effect.

Also, in the Wisconsin Central Renewal Case, this Board gave great consideration and weight to climatic and geographic factors in the State of
Minnesota. It was pointed out that the severity of winters oftentimes renders surface transportation impossible and hazardous. Long, hard winters often stimulate travel by air. I feel this is a criteria which should also apply to Montana.

To further up-date the Examiner's finding, I should like to call to your attention the fact that since the hearing was held in Montana, the Air Force has announced that the Glasgow Air Force Base at Glasgow would become a part of the Strategic Air Command as well as the Air Defense Command. As you perhaps know, these bases are now under construction and by the end of fiscal year 1959, it is estimated that there will be 1,157 military personnel, 97 civilian employees, 2,257 dependents, and it is further estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1962, there will be approximately 3,489 military personnel, 295 civilian personnel and 3,927 dependents, which makes a total of 7,711 people added to the community of Glasgow. This figure on dependents is arrived at by estimating that there are approximately 2.5 dependents for every serviceman; consequently, the population of Glasgow will be more than doubled by that time. It is true the Air Force will have its own planes, but the dependents and civilians attached to such an operation, except when on official duty, will have to use commercial airlines. Thus local service awards in Montana will serve to further the National Defense.

I also wish to bring to your attention that within the past month, the Department of the Army has announced that they propose two Nike-Hercules projects in Montana. One of these is to be located at Glasgow and the other at Great Falls. At each of these projects, there will be additional military service personnel over and above what I have mentioned previously.

I know that I need not tell you how important an air base of this kind is to national defense, and I feel that the Board should give far more consideration to this point than was given by the Examiner.
As you perhaps know, there is a Strategic Air Command Base at Great Falls and if air service should be extended to the Hi Line, there would be coordination for civilian transportation between Glasgow and Great Falls which would also bring about more accessibility by civilian airlines to other defense installations in the State such as the Radar Installations in Cut Bank, Havre, Kalispell, Miles City, Opheim and Lewistown.

If service is granted along the Hi Line, it would also bring closer communication along the Hi Line with our Canadian neighbors. As you know, the communities of Wolf Point and Sidney are in the Williston oil basin where there is considerable oil development. I anticipate that there will be considerable population and economic growth in these cities.

As of now, availability of transportation in this area is so bad there can be no workable relationship. Also, there is a great common interest in other areas of the State, but because of the inconvenience of transportation, it cannot be developed.

The northern part of Montana is, basically, an "Underdeveloped Area" and I feel that this Board would be taking a step forward by granting air service to this area, and would be justified in using Federal funds in doing so. It is true that this service will have to be subsidized. However, I feel that the Board would be justified in issuing a certificate on a temporary basis for a period of, say 5 years, and if at the end of this time, the traffic did not warrant continuing such expenditure, you could then consider the denial of a permanent certificate to any air line. What we ask is a fair chance to prove our need. I feel that the Hi Line cities can justify their request for authorization of this route, on the basis of the Board's "Use It or Lose It" policy as announced in the Seven States Area Case. I also wish to bring to your attention that great consideration should be given to the request of Livingston for air service. As you know, this community has never been served and there is a request to tie Livingston in on a
route to Boise from Billings. This also would add to the feasibility of service along the Hi Line and it would appear that this could be economically justified.

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting for the record various documents which show the interest of our State of Montana and which I will not take the time to read; however, I would appreciate any consideration the Board will give to these supporting documents. If Montana is not given this opportunity to prove their need for air transportation, it will be a long time before they can again present their case to the CAD. They sincerely believe that they can support additional service, and I feel the same consideration should be given to Montana as you have already done in the Seven States Case and the South Central Local Service Case which granted new service to places in Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas so that towns such as Glasgow, Havre, Shelby and Livingston can be served.

In summary, I feel that the vital needs of Montana for local air service not only for emergency transportation, but to assist in the certain economic development of our area deserves your most careful attention. Furthermore, I feel that in equity our Montana communities deserve that same opportunity to prove that they can also develop traffic that you have recently accorded these other States and areas.

My statement is concurred in by my colleagues, Senator James E. Murray and Congressmen Leroy Anderson and Lee Metcalf who have been vitally interested in the addition of air service to Montana. It is not possible for them to be here for this hearing, but we have discussed this case very thoroughly and they are fully in accord with the views I have expressed.

There are representatives from the various cities in Montana and of the air lines who will go into more detail on the technicality of their requests, but I feel that I should leave you with one thought: Montana is interested in retaining what air service it has and wants additional service for its communities which are not now being served.