

# ERIE RAILROAD COMPANY



M. C. SMITH, JR.  
GENERAL COUNSEL  
P. H. DONOVAN  
GENERAL SOLICITOR  
J. P. CANNY  
ASST. GENERAL COUNSEL  
J. T. CLARK  
GENERAL ATTORNEY

LEGAL DEPARTMENT  
MIDLAND BUILDING  
CLEVELAND 15, OHIO

T. D. CAINE  
ASST. GENERAL ATTORNEY  
R. D. LACKLAND  
ATTORNEY

F. G. HOFFMANN  
ASST. GENERAL COUNSEL  
50 CHURCH ST.  
NEW YORK 7, N. Y.

In your reply please refer to our file 22965

*Believe our suggestion  
to have contemplated all  
following to some extent  
7/17*

July 17, 1959

Erie-Lackawanna Merger  
-----

*Under go of Chicago, Ill  
General York, New York, N. Y.  
Cleveland, Ohio, Niagara Falls, N. Y.  
General Station - New York  
Effort*

Mr. D. R. Thompson  
Vice President

Perhaps my letter of July 16th concerning shipper testimony should be clarified.

When I referred to shippers "who now use the service of both the Erie and the Lackawanna", I did not mean the use of both railroads on one shipment but rather shippers who can and do choose between the Erie and the Lackawanna on a competitive basis. In other words, after the hearing I want to be in a position to argue that shippers are in favor of the merger even though the merger will eliminate the existing competition between the Erie and the Lackawanna.

Without attempting to indicate which shippers you should select, examples would be Endicott-Johnson at Binghamton who can and do use either the Erie or Lackawanna, a shipper at Chicago who can and does use either the Erie or the Lackawanna for export traffic through the Port of New York, etc.

I am not sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Schmidt, thinking that you can clarify the situation with him direct.

*M. C. Smith, Jr.*  
General Counsel.