100.4

Remarks

by

Honorable Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary
for International Affairs
Department of Transportation
Washington, D. C.

Before the Committee for Research Cooperation
of the OECD, Paris, France, June 5 & 6, 1967

The United States Department of Transportation is a new organization at the cabinet level in the United States Government. Its task is to bring to the national government, at the highest possible level, a broad coordinated view of the problems and potentials of transportation today--a view which encompasses all varieties of transportation vehicles, all manner of transportation problems. An important responsibility of the Department is to assure that this broad view and this same concern for coordination are applied to the international transportation activities of the United States.

It seems to me that the problems of international research and development cooperation in the field of transportation are not unlike the problems which convinced United States Officials and the United States Congress that there should be a U. S. Department of Transportation. In the United States, there has been a wastefulness in time and money because of the lack of coordination among the various transportation systems. In the world today, there is a similar wastefulness of time and money because there is too little coordination and too little cooperation in transportation research and development.

The need for international cooperation is clear, and it is urgent. The streets of our cities on the American continents, in Europe and in Asia are choked by motor vehicles. Our subways are jammed and our commuter

FR
1055
aggedg 67 0605
2/28/69
00105
FAA-S #1

trains are too often uneconomical. Our airplanes fly with great speed, but they land at crowded and inefficient airports. Pollution is in our air, on our beaches, and in our waterways. Transportation noise engulfs us.

The solutions to many of the problems of transportation are at hand. Those of us who were here saw some of the potential solutions last week as we attended the Paris Air Show. But what has been disturbing to me, at the Air Show and elsewhere, is that in Europe, in Japan and in North America vast amounts of public and private funds are being expended separately, with no regard to each other, for essentially the same purposes. Why should we in the United States spend millions of dollars for research to find answers which Europeans have already discovered? Why should the nations of Europe spend millions on problems to which we in the United States know the answer?

There is a great challenge to all of us, I believe, in the economies which are potentially available in cooperative research, cooperative development and cooperative production in the field of transportation.

In the past twenty years, the Atlantic nations and Japan have learned much about international cooperation. Yesterday, in this very building, the OECD celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the speech of General George Marshall which brought into being one of the most productive cooperative international efforts of all time. Certainly, then, we are capable of designing an international cooperative research effort to attack the many problems facing our modern societies in the field of transportation.

We have learned a great deal about international cooperation also from what has happened in areas of military concern. There have been efforts

at cooperation in the development of weapons and other military equipment, but few of those efforts have been successful. Too often, nationalistic concerns have hampered those undertakings. In the field of transportation—especially urban and short-range transportation—the problems are not so large. We need not be plagued by questions of security. We need not be secret about those innovations which are not necessarily secret.

If we resolve to cooperate, we will have on our side a friendly force which the military has not had, and that force is the public—the people of all our countries. The people who suffer the traffic jams and the sluggish commuter systems, the people whose eyes smart from pollution—these people will be with us. Working together, we can purchase for them time, and comfort, and convenience. High-speed commuter vehicles; short-range aircraft that can land in or near cities; small, economically powered vehicles that can be operated efficiently by individuals within cities—these are the kinds of devices for which our peoples will be grateful.

I am, then, pleading for a new magnitude of international cooperation in the field of transportation. I think we in the United States can learn from your advances--from aircraft producers in several countries, from high-speed ground vehicle developers such as Hovercraft in England and Aerotrain in France, from the urban planners of England, from the high-speed train operators of Japan.

But do not misunderstand me, please. I did not come here to say that we have found United States industry incapable of handling the problems of transportation. On the contrary, we believe that our own industry will continue to use its resources--its business judgment and its management

talent and development skills—to work toward solutions, and to find them. What we in the United States Government wish to help create is an atmosphere in which other nations can take advantage of our capabilities while Americans are taking advantage of theirs.

The strength of the United States lies, in large part, in the riches of its diversity. This general statement of pride and of vigor is as applicable to transportation as it is to any other field. But our national diversity will be enhanced, I believe, if it is augmented by the worthwhile contributions of others. And so will yours. What I request is that we each utilize, in transportation, the best of what we all have to offer. For the United States I ask no more, certainly, than what we in the United States are willing to give.

How can we approach solutions to the problem of cooperation in transportation research and development? Well, gentlemen, we are here; and I—speaking for the U. S. Department of Transportation—am ready.

For a start, certainly this forum can make a major contribution by identifying the priority areas in which cooperative efforts will be mutuall beneficial. We have prepared for distribution here today a summary of the research and development activities of four agencies of our department—the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railway Administration and the U. S. Coast Guard. These summaries indicate the scope of our work. We hope you will indicate to us those areas in which you believe we can begin now to cooperate.

There is no doubt that urban and mass transportation is a crucial area of interest for all of us gathered at this table. Many of the probl in this area are common to us all. Most of our nations are investing lar

amounts of public and private funds to deal with those problems—too often, I might say, simply to by-pass them.

Many devices are available to us if we as nations resolve to rationali our efforts. We can surely do no less than establish an institutional fram work for the exchange of information resulting from our separate research and development investments. But we can go further. In the early stages of research and development, we can allocate tasks; and in the later stages let us place our money in the common pot for the development of specific systems.

Within the limits of national authority, we should seek to open our contracts to international competitive bidding. In some cases, a single nation can be made the executive agent for a research and development project—not only to speed the completion of the project, but to serve as well as a symbol of the confidence we have in each other's willingness and ability to work toward common, identifiable goals.

I am happy to report here today that the Department of Transportation has decided to give its full support and backing to U. S. contractors who hope to bring to the United States the Breguet 941 STOL airplane developed and produced in France. By utilizing the 941 our people can gain deeper insights on the use of STOL and V/STOL aircraft in thickly populated areas.

I can report also that the Federal Highway Administration within our department wishes to consult with organizations in Europe, such as the British Road Laboratory and the University of Uppsala in Sweden, to see how we can obtain certain kinds of information we need for our highway traffic and safety programs. Some information can most efficiently be obtained from organizations, such as these, which have worked in these and

related fields in European countries.

As you know, we in the United States are devoting a great deal of attention to the problems of automotive and highway safety. The Department of Transportation is ready to join with the OECD nations in a broad cooperative research program in this area if one can be developed. We have no preconceived ideas about how this cooperation should be managed, and we are prepared to draw from a variety of sources so that the needs can most efficiently be met.

We are ready, for example, to participate in a broad, coordinated research effort undertaken under the management of the OECD. Yet, on some occasions, it might be preferable to engage in bilateral or trilateral cooperative research programs. Because of a desire in the United States to move ahead rapidly on high-priority aspects of our research program, we will engage in some bilateral arrangements at least until a broader, coordinated program is established and working effectively.

The Department of Transportation is a new department in the United States Government, but its constituent agencies are for the most part not new. Some of them are already cooperating with some of the agencies of your governments in various fields of transportation research. Working together as nations, and through organizations such as the OECD, we can expand these efforts vastly. And together, as public servants, you and we can create the international climate in which private industries can cooperate across national boundaries, with or without the financial participation of governments.

Cooperation has been described as "doing with a smile that what you are compelled to do." I think this cynical view could be attached frequent

to what poses for international cooperation in some fields. But let me say that no one compels the United States today to seek the transportation advice or the transportation devices of others, and no one compels other nations to do so--except that the need of our manufacturers and farmers to move their goods is compelling, and the need of our peoples to move themselves. These needs, which are at the heart of the problems of our cities and our industries, are what is compelling to me.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL AIR SYSTEMS SEMINAR OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1967, NOON

I am pleased to be with you today; for this is, I believe, a significant occasion. It is the final day of the Second International Air Systems Seminar.

That word "Second" is important. The First International Air Systems Seminar was, no doubt, as successful as this one has been. But first years can always be successful. It is the second effort that counts.

I am told that the sponsors of the Seminar now hope to make it at least a biennial event. Those plans are a tribute to how well you have done.

One of the things which strikes me about the Seminar is that it has been an ambitious undertaking. You as students -- or, more precisely, as seminarians -- have come great distances from 15 different nations to participate. And we in Washington have been honored to have you.

The sponsoring groups in this country include the Agency for International Development, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, various segments of the United States aviation industry and the great institution which today becomes your alma mater -- American University.

You who are about to become graduates of the Seminar obviously came here to learn, so I am confident that I can speak to you as men who will always be learning new things, always testing new ideas and equipment, and always assuming new responsibilities. You are aviation men, but I suspect that some of you will, as your careers continue, go far beyond aviation alone. So I will speak to you not simply as aviation men, but as men concerned with all the affairs of your governments.

And I would like you to climb with me today high up into the control tower where we can see, far off in the distance, not only the systems of today -- and not only the airplanes, but also the trucks and trains, the barges and the ships. And, beyond the horizon, the V/STOL aircraft, the ground-effect machines, and the 200-mile an hour train -- that is, all the various kinds of transportation systems of today and tomorrow. While looking at this broad picture, let us talk a little about transportation as a whole in your countries -- about how you can help us, and about how we in the U. S. Department of Transportation, working through the Agency for International Development, may be able to help you.

First, a word about the new Department of Transportation. We are quite young -- less than three months old. But we have under the Departmental umbrella some very experienced, and very expert, agencies. The Federal Aviation Administration is one. The U. S. Coast Guard and the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation are others.

Our remaining major constituent agencies -- the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration -- are newly organized, like the Department itself; but they too possess some older and wiser heads, including those in the Bureau of Public Roads.

What is the purpose of the Department of Transportation? In a word, its purpose is to bring to the United States Government, at the Cabinet level, broad and coordinated national leadership for transportation as a whole.

Too often in this country our transportation planning has been uncoordinated and sporadic. If you examine the history of the United States and the importance of transportation to that history, it is difficult to see how we escaped so long without a Department of Transportation.

But, you might ask, what has this to do with us? What has the U.S. Department of Transportation to do with the developing nations of the world?

President Johnson has supplied the answer. On March 30 he directed the new Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd -- and I quote -- to ". . .assist, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, the less developed nations of the world to overcome their critical transportation problems."

That is our mandate. The Agency for International Development is the experienced and capable administrator of the technical assistance programs of the United States. We in the new Department of Transportation are prepared now to serve that agency, and you.

After receiving Mr. Creager's invitiation to be with you today, I looked over a schedule of what you have been doing at the Seminar. Obviously, you have seen a great deal of what has been successful in United States transportation.

You visited Dulles International Airport, a striking example of advanced airport design. You visited the Pan American World Airways facilities in New York and Bell Helicopter Company's facilities in Texas. Two days ago you were in North Carolina at the headquarters of Piedmont Airlines, a local-service carrier whose energy and patient ambition have brought it, under Tom Davis' admirable executive direction, from a small fleet of DC-3's to an important domestic role in the jet age. These are successes of the sort which prove the dynamics of what we in this country like to call "the American dream."

But I want to tell you about another side of the United States transportation story. There have been failures. In its early years, as the nation struggled to develop itself, large amounts of money were spent on canals and highways that never paid for themselves. When the railroads came, many early turnpikes fell into disuse and disrepair. And not always were the railroad entrepreneurs successful.

In his book Strategy for Mobility, which I hope you have found time to read, Wilfred Owens sums up the story. "The payoffs from transport have been spectacular," he says, "but so have the losses."

This nation struggled over and around many obstacles to develop its transportation systems. Some of the obstacles were physical and geographic. Others were technological. Others were economic. Your nations face many of the same problems, but you have an advantage. You can profit from our mistakes as well as from our successes.

And you can profit from our eagerness to help.

I say you can profit from our mistakes. How? Well, in this country, long ago, we often built turnpikes for which there was no traffic, either because the economic potential was not sufficiently developed or because the railroads, for example, came along shortly thereafter and stole away the transportation trade.

The problem was that our planning tools at that time -- our investment guidelines, if you will -- were not adequate for the job of planning for transportation. But in the 20th Century, you need not make those mistakes. The planning and management skills are available to you -- in your own countries and in ours through the Agency for International Development and the Department of Transportation.

And the technological tools are available also, so that when you make your decisions, you can match vehicles to roadways, vessels to ports, aircraft to airports, with some assurance that the matching will be compatible. And you can fit the different means of transportation to each other and to the over-all need to move people and goods, so as to look always toward a coordinated, and integrated, national transportation system. And finally you can assure that your transportation system is in balance with the rest of your national economy.

It is a good time, I submit, to be planning economic development; for never before has so much talent and so much knowledge been available to those who are willing to help themselves.

In this country, we of the Department of Transportation have formed a partnership with the Agency for International Development, and we trust that that partnership will lead to innovations and to new efficiency in the nation's technical assistance programs.

But we do not propose to help each developing nation equip itself immediately with a complete set of transportation systems. There may be times when someone in your country is urging that a paved highway be carved through the wilderness while we argue vigorously that you should settle, for the moment, for marking barge lanes on your natural waterways. There may be times when your national airline wants a new fleet of jet-powered aircraft while we argue instead that you should be purchasing more mundane vehicles such as buses. My point is this -- that transportation is never an end in itself. It must never be more than a means to serve the needs of your people and to improve the quality of their lives.

And keep in mind that transportation systems are as perishable as they are precious. Highways must be maintained or they quickly begin to disintegrate. Waterways must be dredged. Spare parts for aircraft must be kept at hand. Turbine engines must be handled with tender and skillful affection.

Napoleon said that "Artillery on the road is junk." Idle railroad cars, airplanes rusting on hardstands -- these too are junk.

At the same time, we recognize, of course, that transportation systems economically established and properly used are aggressive servants. They stimulate economic development. Obviously, your products are worthless unless they find their way to the marketplace. We stand ready to help you devise the means of getting them there. We ask only that you join us in looking first at the real needs to be met. Today's technology gives all of us the luxury of being able to pick and choose among modes of transportation, but pick and choose we must.

Now, If I may, let me speak to you again as aviation men; and in so doing, I know that I am speaking to the elite of your nation's transportation leaders. For I know that the airways remain glamorous in your countries as well as in this country. You fly while others plod along the waterways and highways. Partly because of the glamour of the airways, some of you no doubt receive at least your fair share of your nation's budgets. And you are the pioneers of the new age, for in some instances you are doing with airplanes what we in this country had to do with pack mules and wagon trains and plank roads and canals.

And yet I heard the other day about a complaint voiced by an air executive in one of your countries. He was talking about an area of his country in which there have been few roads, and in which airplanes have been carrying cargo across the jungles. At first glance, the man's complaint seemed justified. "We flew cargo at the rate of 20 centavos a kilo," he said; "It is the best we can do. But when the roads came, the cargo was moved for three centavos a kilo. We lost the business."

In the broader view, his complaint should not really be a complaint, but a cause for pride. Without the airplanes and the economic base they helped to build, there could probably have been no roads. In the long run, better and more extensive highways and railways won't hurt your air systems. The more your nation's economy flourishes, the more items of high value and small bulk there will be to move by air -- and the more tourism and domestic travel. You, then, are the pioneers. In South America, Brasilia would not exist today except for air transportation. But Brasilia would have no hope of growing -- the interior of Brazil would have no hope of economic development -- if there were no prospect for cheap and dependable surface transportation.

Be advocates for aviation, and fight hard for it. But fight with the knowledge that if your victory is too large it will defeat the ultimate objective -- the total development of your country. Do not take the attitude that every dollar spent for roads, every dollar spent for port development in your country is a dollar out of aviation's pocket.

Where long-distance, international aviation is concerned, I think there is a danger that too many developing nations will let their ambitions outpace their economic capabilities. In this age of the large jetliners, and as we stand at the door to the age of the supersonic transport, the complexity and the cost of international air systems are all the more apparent. I promise you that the United States Department of Transportation will not support the premature formation of new international airline systems. On the other hand, we may well assist groups of nations which formulate regional airline plans. We were sympathetic to the concept which led in Africa to the founding of Air Afrique, and we believe strongly that regionalism in air transportation is the way of the future.

Before closing, I would like to give you some more specific ideas of how we in the Department of Transportation may help with your problems. I want to acknowledge also that our eagerness to help is not entirely unselfish. You will not buy the goods that United States industry wants to sell you if you cannot transport those goods in your own countries.

You have learned during your Seminar of the abilities and capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration. I am sure you are as impressed as I have been. And the skills of the Bureau of Public Roads are well known in the developing nations of the world.

The Coast Guard has ideas and capabilities, too, which I'm sure your countries will be able to utilize. A Coast Guard officer was telling me the other day about some of them: containerized port developments, surface-effect vessels capable of carrying hundreds of tons of cargo at speeds of a hundred knots; collapsible storage containers which resemble giant sausages and which could be towed along relatively unimproved waterways carrying petroleum products or bulk chemicals.

The Coast Guard officer added, however, that such ideas are of no value without a system of aids to navigation -- without simple things such as buoys. Regardless of the type of vessels used, the best equipment or the most primitive equipment may get into trouble unless waterways are adequately marked.

In my own office, we hope to establish a center to guide within the United States your fellow countrymen and other professional visitors who want to learn about our transportation systems. You found your way to this fine Seminar because of your own energy and that of such men as John DuBois of the Agency for International Development and Mr. Creager. We intend to see to it that other visitors who come looking for such transportation information as this country possesses can find it.

A transportation official from Peru might well be directed to Colorado, where he will find similar high-altitude problems and perhaps some solutions. A visitor from the Philippines could perhaps learn things of value at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Connecticut.

I do not suggest that the United States is the library in which can be found all knowledge of transportation. I am certain that transportation solutions now being found in, for example, the Philippines would be of value in, say, Indonesia. You can help us develop the clearinghouse procedures which would be of benefit to us all.

We intend to coordinate our technical assistance efforts also with the Europeans and the Japanese, whose transportation technologies also are advanced. By working with them, we can serve your interests. The developed nations have an obligation to you to avoid -- through commercial compulsions and irrational competition with each other -- the risk of selling to you transportation tools which you don't really need.

Like transportation itself, we in the Department of Transportation are but servants. We have placed ourselves at the service of the Agency for International Development, which in turn will place us at your service.

Again, I congratulate you and your sponsors upon the completion of the Second International Air Systems Seminar. I congratulate you, again, not merely as air specialists, but as transportation men.

100.3

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE COUNCIL FOR TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS LAW, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, AT THE ST. FRANCIS HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, JULY 27, 1967, 7:00 P.M.

At gatherings of this sort I am reminded of what Thomas Jefferson said about Congress: "That 150 lawyers should do business together is not to be expected."

Nevertheless, let us make the effort. Being a lawyer myself, I will begin by claiming two privileges of you. First, I refuse to be silenced by the collective and specialized wisdom of this group. And second, I ask your leave to assert boldly that it is about time we saw some significant changes in the law of international transportation.

And I will remind you of one thing further. If international transportation law is a mess -- and it is -- then, after all, we lawyers cannot escape a collective responsibility; or, at least, those colleagues

FR
1037

aggedy 67 0727 00104
2/26/69 FAA-S#1

in the law who have preceded us. As a matter of fact, reference to one of our nation's greatest legal craftsmen is relevant if only because so many of today's international transportation laws have their origins with Thomas Jefferson's contemporaries and beyond, and they are indeed outdated.

But that is, of course, part of the beauty of being a lawyer. The messes we create are of such legal complexity that only we can clean them up. There's a fine old proverb about that: "Two attorneys can live in a town where one cannot."

Samuel Johnson said about the courts that "Formalities are accumulated on each other until the art of litigation requires more study that the discovery of right." In our own field of international transportation, the art of completing forms and the art of filing forms seem sometimes to require more study than the discovery of how to sell one's products abroad.

As a matter of fact, the complexities of the requirements and the costs of documentation are such that too many American manufacturers, large and small, stay out of import and export trade because they feel they can't afford it. The ramifications to our balance-of-payments problems and our overall desire to increase international trade are obvious.

As you know, the Department of Transportation is the newest of the departments of the Federal Government. Its tasks are the coordination, if you will, of all forms of domestic and international transportation. And one of our key jobs is to try to coordinate the work of all those people in Government, and in industry, who wish well to international transportation. This is a considerable group. You don't find many people holding seminars on how to interfere with transportation.

In this country today we do not suffer from a lack of enthusiastic coordinators of international transportation. Many dedicated and vigorous private organizations are devoted to the establishment of physical means for making people and goods move more easily, and they are devoted also to the creation of more orderly legal techniques and procedures for transportation.

But unfortunately, the very enthusiasm of these groups, while it dispels apathy, leads to new intermodal, inter-agency and inter-disciplinary problems. Take, for example, the container controversy. The zeal of the proponents of one set of standards for container dimensions is matched only by the dedication of those who favor another set of dimensions.

Perhaps the result of these differences of opinion will be the deployment of armored containers to defend against the advancing columns of opposition containers.

My own modest proposal for an intermodal container has been rejected. I recommended standardized dimensions of 36 by 24 by 36.

* * *

One of our most pressing problems in international transportation is the problem of facilitating international container traffic. A container is a thoroughly intermodal, and international, thing. It is, at the same time, a domestic trailer body carrying the cargo from the manufacturer to the port, a box in which cargo is shipped abroad by sea or air, and -- again -- an overland trailer abroad.

Clearly, a new contraption such as this does not fit very conveniently into our existing legal and regulatory patterns. It isn't convenient for the Customs people to climb into for their picking and probing. Nor does it match well with some of the methods used by inland, ocean and air carriers.

But if our traditions, and our customs, and our victorian-styled regulatory structure don't seem to accommodate the container revolution, then it is they -- not the containers and the other breakthroughs -- that are at fault. Technology can hardly be blamed for not waiting for the rest of us.

And let us look not only at goods, where loss, damage or delay is a serious matter. Let us look at people, too. Their loss or their damage is quite a serious thing, but their delay is too often viewed with complacency. Here again, we can discern a significant difference between what the technology promises and what the public actually gets.

Every one of us has had the experience of a smooth and pleasant 37-minute, martini-oriented jet airplane ride, preceded and followed by a hot, crowded and unpleasant hour and 37 minutes of traffic, taxi, parking, baggage and boarding delays. Consider then the frightening

prospect when the jumbo jets and the supersonic transport begin to disgorge hundreds of passengers at a time into our already overburdened airport facilities. Unless we do something to speed the continuation of their journeys, we may well be called upon to start serving martinis in the waiting lines.

Some transportation problems are like wasting diseases. We all know that all automobile traffic will someday come to an absolute standstill in downtown Manhattan -- but not yet, we say; not tomorrow. The jumbo jet is a new technological baby whose arrival already is hearalded with trumpets. We know the baby is coming and that it is going to be a big one, but are we tending to our knitting?

Only with a great deal of urgent work today, and only by working urgently together, can Government and private agencies deal with the coming floods of passengers. We have to plan. We have to plan fast. And we have to plan something new. Just as an example, your passport may begin to look like a credit card. Why not? And if not, how else are we going to deal with four or five hundred entering international travelers?

* * *

In addition to the specific problems of goods in containers and people in planes, we also have a thoroughly intermodal problem of escalating documentation. With the shipping public insisting on rapid through international transportation, the documentation problems are getting not only worse but also more apparent. Alarming reports are circulating about paperwork. We hear that 800 different forms exist, that the costs of paperwork amount to almost 10 percent of the value of our international trade -- say, five billion dollars a year for form-filling. And we hear that the complexity of the system is such that it would take a piece of paper twelve feet long just to list the steps necessary to process an export shipment.

These reports are all the more alarming because they are true. What should be cheap, quick and simple is somehow expensive, slow and difficult.

Here again the problems are found not in the technology but in the existing laws and regulations. I do not know a valid reason why we lawyers cannot produce a simple set of standard international documents and an agreed way of dealing with them. I wonder sometimes why it is that we who are involved in international transportation never seem to have heard of such things as computers.

The creation of simple and efficient documents and methods of handling them fall under the heading "facilitation." It is a simple word. It may be too simple to have the proper effect on the layman, since we use it to describe such difficult processes.

The Government, the carriers, the shippers and the world at large have been talking about facilitation for years, but the problems have been gigantic. And so it gives me great pleasure to announce to you at this time the institution of our own crash program to do something now.

We know from our many talks with carriers that a large number of carriers of all modes are ready to offer through rates for international intermodal transportation, and are ready to use through bills of lading and to assume through responsibility for the movement of cargo. We also know that shippers are anxious to utilize the new container technology and that shippers want through rates, single bills of lading, simplified documentation and single carrier liability. There have been a number of suggestions for new legislation to promote the use of through rates and the issuance of through documents. Mr. Schmeltzer of the Federal Maritime Commission has done particularly outstanding work in developing new ideas to break through intermodal barriers.

While I do not yet know the exact form the new legislation should take, I do begin to see an outline. For one thing, I have

become convinced that any new legislation must be permissive. It must permit the establishment of joint rates on through routes, and it must permit the issuance of through bills of lading. We are speaking about facilitating commerce, and we are speaking about facilitating steps that can be taken in our lifetime. It seems to me that in order to take some first steps right away, we should not become bogged down in legislation which is mandatory, requiring carriers to change their ways or demanding new forms of behavior.

As soon as I return to Washington, we in the Department of Transportation will begin to discuss with the regulatory agencies our ideas as to new legislation. This round of talks will begin at once and should not last too long, because we know that each of the regulatory agencies recognizes the importance of doing something

as soon as possible to promote the easy use of the new technology. After talking to the regulatory agencies, we will seek the ideas of all kinds of carriers and all types of shippers and receivers. Then, after our ideas finally take shape and after the usual Government clearance, we will go to Congress and ask them for a new bill.

It would be premature for me to discuss specific provisions of our proposal just yet. I will say that I hope the permissive approach will prevail.

Our aim is to help those carriers who want to participate in intermodal joint rates and who want to offer those rates to the shippers who want to use them. This approach may not please all of the people all of the time, but we are going to try.

Our door is open in Washington and in the next few months we hope to see a great deal of a great many of you, and to receive your advice and your counsel on what I think will become one of the most important pieces of transportation legislation in the next session of Congress.

* * *

The history of our Federal establishment, as well as the history of Federal regulation of transportation of all kinds, has in the past led to a highly segmented view of transportation problems. The Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Customs, the Bureau of the Census, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Maritime Administration, and the immigration and security authorities and, of course, the three great regulatory agencies -- the ICC, the FMC and the CAB: all these have had jurisdiction in varying degrees over the international flow of goods and people.

The new Department of Transportation has not taken over all these organizations. Obviously, none of us thinks it should. But the Department has been given enough organizational muscle to make the kind of beginning I have just described.

We have established in the department an Office of Facilitation which has begun the task of assisting, prodding, planning and working with other agencies, with private groups and with international organizations. Our goal is a facile transportation future.

The Office of Facilitation is a small office. I suspect it will remain so. But I warn you that our sights are set high. For example, while we do not foresee a document-free future, we do hope for one in which a shipper anywhere in the world will fill out a standard form from which, by standard coding, all that is accomplished by today's many documents will flow with electronic ease.

While this may seem a distant goal, it is a perfectly feasible one. We are not going to abandon it without a fight.

* * *

You members of the Federal Bar Association and your distinguished guests may well hear of our great plans, our high hopes, and our shining goals with an uneasy sense that I am about to pass the plate. I am. To achieve any one of our goals will require a great deal from the legal community.

From lawyers, and especially from the Federal Bar Association, ~~advising our departments and agencies and bureaus~~, we ask:

-- First, your good will. We cannot move a step unless you are willing to consider modifications in the relevant laws and regulations.

-- Second, we require your ideas and your advice. You are the experts, and you know where today we have conflicts, overlaps and delays. You also know how to eliminate at least some of them.

-- My third, and perhaps most important request goes more toward ~~the~~ Federal officialdom than toward ~~the~~ private lawyers. Our common efforts will require a good deal of unselfishness on the part of all of us who have a place in the established order of things. We must realize that intermodal transportation is going to mean taking down some of the jealously guarded jurisdictional fences. Every agency and bureau will have to take a broad view of its place in the entire transportation process. Everyone, and especially lawyers, will need to be looking at the system -- as a whole -- and not the parts.

Some people would say that I should be careful in coming before a group of lawyers to ask for help. You perhaps have heard the story of the two burglars who were working a very attractive house in a well-to-do section of the city.

The first burglar had gone inside to pick up what he could. The second burglar was keeping watch outside. Finally, after what seemed an awfully long time, the first burglar emerged.

"Did ya find anything?" asked the second burglar.

"Nah," said the first. "This place belongs to a lawyer."

" Yeah?" said the second. "Well, did ya lose anything?"

But my abiding faith is that you, as lawyers, will help us solve the problems of international transportation. The goals are high; the effort required of all of us is immense.

And the burden of my message is that your contribution is indispensable.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20591

STATEMENT BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, AT U.S. COAST GUARD DIVING OPERATIONS OFF THE COAST OF NEW JERSEY, MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1967

Today the Coast Guard is setting out to determine the extent of the danger to the coastline from tankers which sank many years ago with cargoes of oil and other petroleum products. The Coast Guard, which became part of the Department of Transportation on the first of April, is our strong right arm, especially in this effort to explore sunken tankers and in the broader study of the whole question of oil pollution.

This venture today is in many ways a mystery story. Little is known about what has happened to the ships and their cargoes during their years at the bottom of the sea. Most of the tankers lying off the Nation's coast were the victims of German submarines during the early days of World War II. Those were busy, tragic days. There was no time then for concern about pollution problems the ships might present 25 years later.

But we know today, all too well, the nature of the problem. In March, the ship Torrey Canyon went aground near the British Isles, sending its cargo of crude oil on a sweeping path of destruction. Thousands of waterfowl drowned as a result of the Torrey Canyon disaster. Other thousands died shivering with pneumonia, their natural protection destroyed by the ugly coat of oil. The damage to beaches will be felt in England for months, perhaps years.

And in April, a "black wave" of oil pollution hit Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The damage there was serious, and parts of the Cape were saved from a dismal summer season only because severe storms came a few days later and dispersed most of the oil. No one knows when the next "black wave" will arrive.

Oil's importance to the life of the Nation is obvious. Petroleum products account for 40 per cent of the total waterborne tonnage in the United States. We can't simply quit shipping oil because of its potential for pollution. But we must reduce the danger; for when we talk about oil pollution, we are talking about a threat to life itself.

The sea is the cradle of life. What happens to the plankton floating on the surface of the sea -- the tiny plants and creatures -- determines what happens to the fishes, and they in turn determine whether man will be able to continue to feed himself. Researchers have

determined that the slightest trace of oil eliminates the microscopic vegetable matter upon which oysters feed. Crabs and other shellfish lose their food when oil arrives on the water's surface, and food fish such as flounder are chased away from their shallow breeding grounds.

Off Rhode Island several years ago, the crew of a stricken tanker pumped a few hundred thousand tons of bunker oil overboard in an effort to save the ship. The result was the elimination of the oyster population in Narragansett Bay. There are other stories of fishing grounds destroyed, of bird species all but eliminated, by oil pollution. If we proceed as we have, we can turn the cradle of life into a grave.

In recent years we have begun to think about the quality of life in America. We have begun to think about air pollution and to do something about it. The Torrey Canyon thrust upon us a recognition of oil pollution, and we must do something about it, too. Clean waterways and unspoiled beaches are among the places where men find a better quality of life. They are not small things.

Inland, we have begun to preserve wilderness areas. We would not tolerate the risk of killing off all the trees or all the deer in one of these areas. Well, the sea may be our greatest wilderness area, and we do risk interrupting the chain of life there. This interruption can come with a major disaster such as that of the Torrey Canyon. Or it can

come slowly, certainly, with the accumulation of small oil spills -- whether they are accidental, or whether they are carelessly incidental.

In May, President Johnson directed the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior to begin an urgent study of possible methods of averting pollution by oil and other substances. The results of that study will be sent to the White House, with recommendations, within the next two weeks. We are going to make recommendations which will involve expenditures of money by those industries which control the sources of pollution, and by the Federal Government. Where procedures or equipment are inadequate, we want to see improvements made. The simple fact is that we can no longer afford thoughtless dumping of oil. The seas and the waterways are not that large. And tankers today are growing so large -- the damage from spillage would be so great -- that the threat of accidents must be reduced to the lowest possible level.

Some of our recommendations will be aimed at the international nature of the problem. It is a striking fact that only about 7 per cent of the world's petroleum tonnage is carried on United States ships. We are concerned because several of the world's major shipping nations are not signatories to international agreements designed to prevent pollution. The Torrey Canyon spilled its oil on both England and France.

The Torrey Canyon was built in the United States, rebuilt in Japan, owned by a Bermuda corporation, registered in Liberia, chartered to a British corporation, and had a crew and master who were Italians. Questions of regulation and control are clearly worldwide. There is much work to be done in the international field, and we intend to press vigorously for international agreements for the control of oil pollution. All the nations of the world have mutual interests here. None of them wants to pollute its adjacent sea.

There's a certain paradox in our concern about pollution of the seas by oil, for throughout most of history it has been thought that spilling oil -- "pouring oil on troubled waters" -- was a good thing. Pliny the Elder said in the First Century, "Everything is soothed by oil." Plutarch, at about the same time, wondered why oil calmed the sea. He speculated that it reduced friction so that the wind could slip by without disturbing the water.

Our scientific understanding is somewhat in advance of Plutarch's, but until quite recently our understanding of pollution and its threat may have been no less imperfect than his.

# # #

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

August 12, 1967

On Monday, August 14, the U.S. Coast Guard will begin diving operations at the sunken tanker Gulftrade off the coast of New Jersey. The Coast Guard in New York is arranging for press coverage from a ship which will go to the site of the operations.

Nevertheless, the enclosed background information and statement by Assistant Secretary of Transportation Agger may be of some value to you. Mr. Agger plans to go Monday to the diving site. His statement, which is enclosed, is for release at 11 a.m. Monday.

Lloyd Preslar

Lloyd Preslar
Special Assistant to the
Assistant Secretary for
International Affairs
and Special Programs

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

August 11, 1967

Background: Examination of Sunken Tanker

Coastal oil pollution became a matter of worldwide concern in March, 1967, when the Torrey Canyon went aground in the British Isles and spilled its 119,000 tons of oil, killing wildlife and spoiling long stretches of beaches.

In April, there was a less disastrous example of oil pollution in the United States. A "black wave" of oil struck the eastern beaches of Cape Cod, staining beaches and injuring waterfowl. Heavy storms battered the Cape soon thereafter. The storms dispersed most of the oil, but occasional traces can still be found.

The source of the oil which hit Cape Cod remains undetermined. Some speculated that a sunken tanker, all but forgotten, had after many years burst its seams on the ocean floor, releasing its cargo to the ocean surface and then to the beaches.

That speculation played a part in the decision by the Department of Transportation and the Coast Guard to begin an examination of sunken tankers off the nation's coastline. Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd announced on July 27 that the Coast Guard would undertake the diving operations. The Gulftrade was selected as the first ship to be examined. The Gulftrade was built in 1920 and was sunk in 1942 by submarine action off the coast of New Jersey.

The examination of sunken tankers is part of a broad study of ocean and waterway pollution begun in May by the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior. President Johnson, on May 26, directed the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of the Interior to undertake the study "on an urgent basis."

Noting both the Torrey Canyon damage and the incident at Cape Cod, the President said in a memorandum to the two Secretaries: "It is imperative that we take prompt action to prevent similar catastrophes in the future and to insure that the Nation is fully equipped to minimize the threat from such accidents to health, safety, and our natural resources."

Secretary Boyd designated Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Special Programs, to coordinate Department of Transportation activities related to the study. The Coast Guard, an operating agency of the Department of Transportation, is directing much of the work, including the exploration of sunken tankers.

Assistant Secretary Agger has been closely associated with the oil pollution activities from the beginning. Early in May he represented Secretary Boyd in London at a meeting of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) to study means of preventing another Torrey Canyon-type accident.

Representatives at the conference agreed that new rules and regulations are needed to govern the merchant fleets of the world. The Coast Guard developed the United States position for the conference.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL AVIATION CLUB OF WASHINGTON, AT THE WASHINGTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1967, 12:30 P.M.

Lately, it seems that we in the Department of Transportation have been less concerned about airplanes - which work very well - than about airports - which don't. Some of our airports are too crowded. Some are boxed in with no room for expansion. Others are outmoded - or soon will be, after the arrival of those jumbo jets. Some airports are inconvenient. Others are so close to city centers and population concentrations that noise levels are a major problem.

Some of these problems - not all of them, mind you - can be solved with money. But money, in these days, can be the largest problem of all. That is why Alan Boyd, the Secretary of Transportation, has been talking quite a bit lately about airport financing. Secretary Boyd has mentioned a small passenger tax as one possible solution to the financial problems of some airports. If I may, I'd like to review with you some of his thinking.

First, given the urgent financial needs of the schools, the cities and other elements of society, the best hope for new money for airports lies in letting the people and organizations who use airports and profit from airports

(more)

pay for them. That is the reason officials of the Department have been talking about user charges; or about a "head tax," if you will, in the case of passengers.

Air transportation is a successful enterprise. It is successful enough that at least the major airports and those who use those airports can pay their own way. At the same time, airports today are not isolated traffic centers with lives of their own. The airport in 1967 is an important part of the city it serves, and it is an asset to the entire community. For that reason, it seems logical that a community served by an airport should have at least as much interest in the life of that airport as the Federal Government has. In that sense, the community is as much the airport's user as the airlines and the passengers are.

As for the so-called "head tax," we are not proposing any such tax. In fact, we are aware that some lawyers think that such a tax imposed by a local airport authority would be considered in the courts an undue burden on interstate commerce.

We are willing to listen to proposals on the problem of financing airports - especially proposals drafted within a context of the desirability of user charges. And I would add this. The Department of Transportation is opposed to any "head tax" which would involve a separate transaction. The passenger arriving at an airport, often after experiencing a traffic tie-up or parking difficulties or both, has quite enough problems already. You know the reason for my strong feeling if you have departed from Orly airport, Paris, or from one of the other foreign airports which collect airport taxes from passengers. Amidst all the difficulties of baggage and passports and ticketing and airline schedules and worrying about unloading those few remaining francs, there stands the harried passenger about to leave for home. And there stands the man behind the counter with his hand out. He wants five dollars - an airport tax for the support of Orly. And when you hand him a ten dollar bill, he wants to give you your change in francs.

We are firmly opposed to that kind of "head tax." It is the business of the Department of Transportation to facilitate travel - to remove delays and nuisances, not to compound them.

I would like to mention today a few of the ideas we have been tossing about in our Office of Facilitation. It is a small office with a small staff, but in my view its activities are directly concerned with some of the Department's most important goals.

(more)

Col. Eddie Guilbert runs our Office of Facilitation. A lot of people are baffled by that word "facilitation" as it applies to transportation. Col. Guilbert has had to explain the word many times, and he has come upon an interesting way of stating the definition.

It happens that "facilitation" has a special meaning to psychologists. In psychology, according to Webster, facilitation is - and I quote - "the increased ease of performance of any action, resulting from the lessening of nerve resistance by the continued successive application of the necessary stimulus."

That's really what our Office of Facilitation is all about. It hopes to continually apply stimuli to the nerve centers located at key points of resistance. Our final goal is the removal of all unnecessary impediments to the free and easy movement of passengers and cargo. A small office in a large Federal Department concerned with a tremendous industry can't hope to accomplish the whole job. But the Office of Facilitation will seek the proper stimuli and will attempt some of the coordination tasks which are so badly needed in the field of transportation facilitation.

In the aviation industry, there are many impediments to the free and easy movement of passengers and cargo, and I submit that quite a few of them are unnecessary. A couple of weeks ago the Department of Transportation cooperated with other government agencies, with the Air Transport Association, and with representatives of aviation and electronics firms in an interesting experiment which demonstrated the potential for using technology to facilitate travel.

What happened was this. A regularly scheduled Trans-World Airlines jet took off from Frankfort, Germany, headed for Dulles Airport. Before the passengers boarded the airplane, they and their travel documents - passports, health records, and so on- were photographed. Then, while the plane was in the air, the photographs were transmitted to Dulles by communications satellite. Thus the customs inspectors and the immigration, agricultural and public health inspectors were armed in advance with written data on the passengers, and the inspectors were able to clear the passengers more expeditiously once <u>they</u> arrived.

We don't regard Comsat as a final answer to our problems of documenting passengers or cargo. As a matter of fact, the very transmission of all those documents led some people at Dulles to ask themselves, perhaps for the first time, whether so many documents were really necessary. At any rate, we had the satisfaction of knowing that we were trying to use technology to solve our problems rather than letting technology use us.

(more)

Perhaps the passenger of the future will need only one official item - say, a passport of the size and shape of a credit card. Why not? And if not, how else are we going to deal with the four hundred or five hundred international passengers who will be aboard just one of those jumbo jets?

And speaking of documents, I would point out to you that government doesn't deserve all the blame for the batch of papers the traveler has to carry. For years the airline industry has been plagued by the problem of ticket thefts. Just this week I read that burglars had raided the Quantas office in Los Angeles and taken away 235 blank airline tickets - tickets with a potential value of a quarter of a million dollars. Let us suppose for a moment that we could do away with tickets - that we could develop some less cumbersome device for matching paying passengers and airplane seats. If we didn't have tickets, we would relieve the passenger of that extra little envelope of documents. And we would eliminate ticket thefts. I say, let's abolish tickets. As you can see, our sights are set high in the Department of Transportation.

Last week, Secretary Boyd sat with other members of the Cabinet at a meeting of the Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. The meeting is an annual get-together of Japanese and American Cabinet officers. Since the Department of Transportation is a new department, it was the first time a U. S. Secretary of Transportation had been present at one of the meetings.

I think it was obvious, though, that the Department of Transportation was well-represented. At the suggestion of Secretary Boyd and his Japanese counterpart, Minister of Transportation Takeo Ohashi, the joint committee agreed to establish a panel of government officials and transportation industry representatives from the two nations. The panel will conduct a far-reaching study aimed at facilitating the flow of passengers and cargo between the United States and Japan.

One of the reasons for the study is Expo 70, a major international exposition which will begin at Osaka, Japan, in the spring of 1970. We expect that many Americans will be going to Japan that year. We also anticipate that by that time, the jumbo jets with their hundreds of passengers may be operating over the Pacific.

What we're going to do in this joint facilitation study with Japan is take a hard look at the total environment of transportation between the two nations. It is obvious that unless a lot of things are done to facilitate travel, there are going to be a lot of disgruntled international travelers in 1970 and beyond.

(more)

The study may include several experiments and demonstration projects. For example, we perhaps can arrange more extensive tests, over the Pacific, of the transmission of travel documents by satellite. We also would like to try out a selective inspection system in which most incoming international passengers could be processed more quickly, simply by segregating those passengers with noticeable illnesses or with duty items to declare. Why keep everyone in those long waiting lines?

We also will look at the sheer number of documents needed for the movement of both passengers and cargo, with an eye toward perhaps suspending some documentation requirements on a trial basis. I, for one, am hopeful that the study with the Japanese will prove helpful far beyond facilitating travel to the Far East. It could be a model for the kind of efforts our government and our industries can undertake on a world-wide basis.

Eddie Guilbert of our Office of Facilitation came back from a joint government-industry facilitation conference the other day simply beaming with optimism about what can be accomplished. Cooperation is the key, and we are aware that cooperation and coordination within the United States government is fully as essential as is cooperation between governments or cooperation between government and industry.

Eddie Guilbert is so excited about the prospects of facilitating travel that he has fashioned a couple of slogans which I certainly wouldn't want to take credit for, but which do illustrate our goals. The first of them is - and I quote - "No passenger line by '69." And in case that's a little too ambitious, we have a fall-back slogan: "No airport queue by '72."

All I am saying is that we are ready to move, with your help, toward the facilitation of transportation. Every one of us has had the experience of a smooth and pleasant 37-minute, martini-oriented jet airplane ride, preceded and followed by a hot, crowded and most unpleasant hour and 37 minutes of traffic, of taxis, of parking and baggage problems and boarding delays. Soon the jumbo jets and the supersonic transports are going to be disgorging hundreds of passengers at a time into our already overburdened airport complexes. Unless we do something to help those passengers get through the airports and continue their journeys, we may well be called upon to start serving martinis in the waiting lines.

# # # # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A FORUM OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION, AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967, 12:15 P. M.

Winston Churchill wrote during his days as a war correspondent in Africa that "victory is the beautiful, bright-colored flower. Transport is the stem without which it could never have flowered."

You can't say it better. You can only add that transportation is the stem not only for military victory, but for peacetime progress and growth. In recent years, however, people have been calling attention to brown spots on the stem. This has led to some basic changes in our approach to transportation in the United States.

One of these changes is the Department of Transportation, the first attempt to provide a truly national base on which to build a system of transportation that is a system in more than name only.

When you talk about defense transportation, you are really talking only about a different way of using your civil transportation system. With this in mind, I intend to concentrate today on what the Department is doing in the civil sector.

My premise is that if we have a good civilian transportation system, we will have a good system for use in an emergency, whether the emergency is caused by natural or man-made disaster. The cross-feed

between military transportation and civil transportation is a healthy one that has been going on for many years. For example, the military borrowed the C-47 from the civil sector during World War II. And, of course, it is a matter of record that the typewriters, the jeeps and the C-47's were the margin of victory in World War II. I don't say that just because Secretary Boyd flew C-47's, either, although it certainly makes it easier to remember.

In return, the military supplied most of the pilots for the airlines of this country through the 1950's, a supply that we're told has begun to run thin.

There are many examples of this sharing of transportation advances by civilian and military America. Before World War II, we built our highways with a view toward their potential value in the defense of the nation. In turn, civil transportation has utilized much of the transportation know-how developed by the military during World War II and later. Our airlines would not be planning today for jumbo jets or supersonic transports if the military had not provided much of the basic technology.

The examples extend right up to this moment. Dr. Haddon, the director of our National Highway Safety Bureau, is looking at the medical evacuation procedures employed in Viet Nam and trying to find ways to get the wounded off our highways and into hospitals as quickly as it is done in battle.

In the Department of Transportation, this exchange between civilians and the military is focused primarily on our Office of Emergency Transportation, where John McGruder is working toward a comprehensive plan to make the nation's transportation capabilities do double duty at any of several levels of emergency.

This is a difficult job. As with civil defense, it is hard to get people interested in shelters until they hear the sirens; and then it is too late. But John McGruder is an able and a persuasive man, and we are making progress under his leadership.

Still, the best emergency transportation plans are of no use if the transportation system itself is not sound. And so we come back to the basic job of the Department of Transportation. President Johnson - when he asked Congress to create the department - called transportation "the web of union." And then, as Secretary Boyd puts it, the President appointed him to get some of the bugs out of the web.

We have the best transportation system in the world, but it is not as good as it could be. I think one of the ways we can make it better is by making even more extensive use of the transportation experience, and the transportation know-how, that the military has to offer. It is the aim of the Department of Transportation to discover and utilize valuable transportation learning wherever it can be found - in this country or abroad. The Department of Defense is one place, where, we believe, there is plenty for us to learn.

I hope also that because there is, now, a Department of Transportation concerned with such things, we can find opportunities for cooperation between the military and civilians in the development of transportation. As an example, let's look at air traffic control. At least in non-combat areas, the problems of controlling military aircraft are not basically different from the problems of civilian air traffic control. It's all the same sky, and that sky is getting crowded.

Yet remarkably little has been accomplished toward adopting common communications systems for use by both civilian and military aircraft for air traffic control. I hope that as we develop more sophisticated equipment, we can find the basis for increased cooperation. The benefits, immediately, would be savings of time, and money, and a better quality of communications - a greater safety margin, perhaps, for civilian operators.

And there is no question that our ability to meet emergency transportation requirements would be enhanced if we of the civilian sector of transportation were tuned in, in effect, to the military's communications and navigation systems.

Now, if I may, I would like to talk to you for a few moments about a portion of the national transportation picture which has been too long overlooked. It is urban transportation, the complex, thorny problem of moving people into, through and out of metropolitan areas. You may ask, understandably, why I should come to this meeting and talk about urban transportation. I will give you three answers. The first goes back to my original thesis. A good transportation system is, by its very nature, a good emergency transportation system; and in America today, our urban areas are of such size and importance that the nation cannot have a good transportation system unless it includes sound urban transportation.

My second reason for wanting to talk about urban transportation has been demonstrated adequately during the last few months. Our cities are in many ways the heart of our nation, but they are distressed

and troubled. The transportation advances which you are talking about in the NDTA meetings, and which many of you concern yourselves with in your private endeavors, are in many ways dependent on the economic and social health of the nation. In turn, the nation's health is dependent on the success of the attack which we, as a nation, can mount against our social and economic problems, including the problems of the cities.

And my third reason follows closely. We are meeting today in a great city, but a city which has obvious problems, transportation and otherwise. Our lives are tied to our cities; our careers are dependent upon them. So in a real sense, we must be concerned with their health.

What are the problems of urban transportation? Well, there is the problem of the commuter - of moving millions of people every day from the suburbs to the city and back again. We are concerned about this. And yet we haven't even figured out yet how to move people from the front of the bus to the rear.

We have invested billions of dollars in urban transportation, and we cannot - if you will pardon the expression - just walk away from the problem. One thing we know: for the foreseeable future, we must solve our transportation problems with tools very much like the ones we have already. At least for a while, the breakthroughs must come not from radical changes in transportation techniques, but from learning to use what we have more efficiently, with greater safety and more comfort and convenience.

This is not to say that the drawing boards are blank. We are experimenting with laser beams for tunneling under cities to carry traffic that cannot or should not go through them. We are studying the linear induction motor to move trains faster, and air cushion systems to move them over less expensive roadbeds.

In the meantime, our breakthroughs will be more on the order of cutting one hour off the run from Washington to New York with a high-speed train. And that will be only one of hundreds of ideas we must test and perfect in all parts of the system before we begin to see any really dramatic change.

Perhaps the most shocking thing you can say about the urban transportation system of America is that, in many cases, it is in much better shape than the urban school system, the urban park system or the urban housing situation.

What we call the transportation crisis is a crisis of the whole city. Americans have worked very hard for the past two centuries building the most advanced industrial society known to man. But about 30 years ago, they began to look around at the cities they had created in the process. And they began to say, this is not exactly what we had in mind. It needs more parks and trees. Too many of the people live in squalor. The schools teach, but too many do not educate. What's more, the bus service is not adequate. The freeway spoils the view. The planes taking off from the airport are noisy. And we did not leave any place for people to walk in the sun.

We have spent a great deal of time arguing not about what to do to solve the problems of the cities, but about what to do first. We have broken up into partisan groups, some pushing rapid transit, some pushing stricter planning, others arguing that the only answer is to get the highways out of the cities.

In short, the very multiplicity of our urban transportation problems hampers our search for long-term solutions. We are in much the same situation as the New England contractor who, some years ago, won a bid to construct a new school. The school board wanted the job done as economically as possible, and with as little inconvenience as possible to the students. So the school board placed two conditions in the contract. First, the contractor had to tear down the old school and use the salvaged materials on the new one. And second, he had to let the students use the old school until the new one was built.

President Johnson was among the first to see that the problem of the cities could not be solved piecemeal but must be dealt with across the board. And he was the first to do something about making it possible for the work to begin.

As a result, the cities of the United States have offers of help from the Federal Government whenever they are fighting against disease, poverty, ignorance and blight. And the offers come in substantially larger amounts than ever before.

The model cities program will provide Federal assistance to make possible not only new houses but new and more liveable designs for neighborhoods. City schools have not only more money, but more creative programs in which to use the money.

Economic development programs help finance new industries to vide jobs in the cities. There is the program for safer streets - most comprehensive crime control program ever proposed by a sident.

And among these - and many more - is our Department of nsportation.

When he asked Congress to authorize the new Department, sident Johnson pointed out that transportation had grown haphazardly America, meeting needs as they arose; never taking into account any l economic or social need.

As a result, the President said, "both people and goods are pelled to conform to the system as it is. . ." And in the broadest se, he saw the Department as a means of helping reverse that er to make the system conform to the needs of people.

In general, we will work toward coordinating the future growth ll modes of transportation toward a true system in which travelers cargo can move from one mode to another with a minimum of delay a maximum of comfort.

Our role in the cities is no different. A taxicab, a bus, a high-speed way serve the same purpose in a city as a school, an art gallery, a ter or an office. They are there because people who visit cities or k in cities or live in cities need them to live well. Our job is to to it that when it comes to transportation, our contribution to the good in the cities is a positive one.

In order to get on with this work, there are a number of facts which must face, no matter how distasteful some may find them. One is that t Americans will move out of a city and into a home with a big yard oon as they can afford it. While we argue over whether this is good ad, Americans are buying suburban houses at the rate of 700,000 a r. While we argue about the merits of high density as opposed to ersal, they are buying automobiles at the rate of more than eight ion a year. And most of them plan to drive those new cars to work morning after they take delivery.

So we come to fact number one: Given the present state of our earch, economy and technology, highways are in the cities not only tay but to spread. American cities are going to depend even more rily on the streets and roads they now have, and they are going to have uild more.

For a handful of metropolitan areas, new or expanded rapid transit systems can and do offset serious congestion, particularly where highways cannot handle peak-hour traffic. But for the majority of American cities and towns, mass transit by rail is not yet economically feasible.

We will, of course, work toward a balance of highways and rail, both on the surface and underground, as the long-range solution to city transportation. But for now, the highway must be the basic tool for most cities.

In accepting the highway, however, we are by no means forced to commit ourselves to our present methods of using it.

Nor are we by any means committed to the methods we have used in the past for choosing the routes over which we build the highways.

The debate over the highway in the city has stirred some powerful emotions and strong language in recent years.

There is one faction that believes all highway engineers should be ridden out of town on a rail - a monorail, if one is available.

The engineers, for their part, insist - and rightly - that to the extent that we made our wishes explicit, they gave us what we asked for: An efficient highway system to serve travelers and commerce at the lowest cost. They certainly cannot be accused of failing to follow any comprehensive metropolitan plan because we seldom - if ever - gave them such a plan.

But the time has come to change the order. In the design of our urban highways, the time has come to include social values which cannot be measured by any standard economic formula. And I am confident that the highway engineers of the nation will once again produce to specifications. I just hope that all of us - the Federal Government, the cities and the suburbs - will produce more carefully thought-out specifications this time.

Let's look at the automobile. It was not designed with the efficient movement of peak-hour volumes of commuters in mind. Nor is it the only way to use the highway.

Actually, the highway is a remarkably versatile element of transportation, and rubber-tired mass transportation is one use of the highway which we are just beginning to discover, or rediscover.

The Federal Highway Administration, under the direction of its able Administrator, Lowell Bridwell, is trying to promote the setting aside of certain lanes of freeways for exclusive use by buses. Federal funds will be available for building special on-and-off ramps for busses.

Another example of our effort to make more efficient use of city highways is in a program called TOPICS. Its objective is to help cities, through both Federal funds and technical support, modernize their downtown street systems.

Urban transportation is where the most difficult problems are; but in building a true system we cannot consider any one set of problems as separate from any other - just as I find it difficult, in the long view, to separate civilian and defense-related transportation needs.

For example, President Johnson has recently directed Secretary Boyd to develop a long-range and comprehensive plan for the facilities, equipment and personnel needed to meet the growth of aviation. At the same time, the President asked for a thorough review of air traffic regulations, flight rules and standards to maintain this country's good air safety record.

That study must proceed along with the search for better transportation between cities and airports; better parking facilities at the airports; better baggage-handling and quieter engines.

At the same time, our Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation will continue its work to improve the speed and comfort of train travel. In my office of International Affairs and Special Programs, we will be working to cut the red tape and paperwork that now stifles much of our commerce with our friends overseas.

The president of the electronics division of Union Carbide, Robert A. Charpie, said recently, and I quote, "With the proper environment, we can haul off and invent and design anything we want."

We intend to take Mr. Charpie up on that, along with the rest of American industry.

There are certainly going to be cases in which new technology is the only answer to a problem.

But I am persuaded at this point in the Department's career that our real progress will come through learning better ways to use the technology we already have - often through learning from others.

The tasks before the Department of Transportation are large ones, and they will require cooperation from industry and from organizations such as yours. We know the job can be done. I say that partly because there is no alternative. It must be done. For example, the problems of the cities must be solved.

The Department of Transportation is not an end to our transportation problems, but we hope it is the beginning of a concerted search for solutions. The Department gives the nation, for the first time in its history, a rational framework for that search.

Thank you.

##

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE FOURTH DELAWARE VALLEY TRANSPORTATION SEMINAR, AT THE HOWARD JOHNSON INN, NEWARK, DELAWARE, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1967, 7:00 P. M.

My topic tonight was assigned to me -- "A Realistic View of Transportation Requirements under the Department of Transportation." It's a good topic. The reason I wanted you to know it was assigned to me is that the first time I saw the topic, I was a little bit bothered by that word "realistic." I wondered if the people of the Delaware Valley had the impression, perhaps, that we people in Washington tend to be unrealistic.

At any rate, I will try tonight to be realistic -- but not too much so. For I am reminded of a few lines of poetry by W. H. Auden:

When statesmen gravely say--"We must be realistic--"
The chances are they're weak and therefore pacifistic:
But when they speak of Principles--look out--perhaps
Their generals are already poring over maps.

I want you to know that although we in the Department of Transportation regard ourselves as realistic, we are not therefore pacifistic when it comes to dealing with transportation problems. Indeed, we are already poring over our maps.

(more)

I don't want to inflict on you tonight my conception of the forms the transportation systems of the future will take. That would be unrealistic not only because I'm a bad prophet, but also because the Department of Transportation doesn't have absolute control. It is not the lord and master of transportation in the United States -- and shouldn't be. Transportation will remain largely in private hands. But I can tell you about some of our attitudes in the new Department, and why we have those attitudes. We're always anxious to tell our story because we think it's a good one.

First, let's look at what the Department is and what it is not. I'll get some of the "is nots" out of the way first.

It is not creeping federalism. Just as we're not looking to take over anybody's railroad, we're not looking to take over any of the transportation functions of the states and cities. As a matter of fact, we hope that because we're available to lend assistance, the states and local areas which are serious about improving their transportation can manage better their transportation affairs.

The Department of Transportation is not a runny faucet on the Federal Treasury. We think we can save money.

It absolutely will not be a refuge for paper shufflers. If nothing else, the Department is too young for that. And it will not engage in bureaucratic overkill.

So what is the Department of Transportation? Exactly one year ago this week President Johnson signed into law the bill establishing the Department. What he said then is appropriate, and I quote:

"During the next two decades the demand for transportation in this country is going to more than double. But we are already falling far behind with the demand as it is. Our lifeline is tangled.

"Today we are confronted by commuter crises, by crowded airports, by crowded air lanes, by screeching airplanes, by archaic equipment, by safety abuses and roads that scar our nation's beauty...

"This Department of Transportation that we are establishing will have a mammoth task -- to untangle, to coordinate and to build the national transportation system for America that America is deserving of."

(more)

This is what the President said. To untangle, to coordinate, to build -- a mammoth task. But not an unrealistic one, I think. And one reason is that despite our problems, we start with the greatest transportation system the world has ever known.

On an organization chart, the Department of Transportation looks like this: A Secretary of Transportation on top, and a group of administrations -- modal administrations, we call them -- working together underneath. For the most part, the modal administrations existed before there was a Department of Transportation, and they were doing a fine job. That new upper level -- the Office of the Secretary -- is relatively small; the President and the Congress saw to that. But I say it proudly, for our job is not to take over the modal administrations, but simply to help them work together -- that is, to coordinate their activities.

We sometimes call this the "systems approach" to transportation. What it all means is simply that we prefer to think of transportation as an entity, not as a variety of machines and roadways running off in all directions. When a product, say, from one of your factories comes off the conveyor belt and goes on a truck, which takes it to a train, which takes it to a ship to be transported to another train and truck and conveyor belt, we like to think of all that motion as a continuous flow -- not as trains and trucks and ships and airplanes and automobiles getting into each other's way and crashing into one another, but as parts of a working system.

Now I realize there's nothing very revolutionary about that. But if you examine the nation's history, and if you examine some of our transportation practices -- or if you simply examine some of our railroad crossings, or our airport access roads, or our urban traffic tie-ups -- you will recognize, I'm sure, that we have been uncoordinated much too long.

The sublime significance of the Department of Transportation is that now, for the first time in our history, we have a focal point, a center of emphasis, that enables us to look at transportation as a whole and then to relate it to the total needs of our society. That last part is what is most important to me -- that is, relating transportation to the needs of society. President Johnson did not propose a Department of Transportation simply in order to provide Washington with another neatly drawn organization chart. Alan Boyd did not accept the tough job of Secretary of Transportation simply because he likes to see things run smoothly. We have some goals which go beyond mere coordination -- goals which we think are tied closely to the quality of life in America.

(more)

For example, the Department of Transportation has devised safety programs which are meatier than catchy sloganizing. The Department is exploring ways to reduce the air and water pollution which has been an unfortunate by-product of our transportation achievements. The Department is looking at all manner of technology in an effort to get the best transportation at the lowest price possible. The Department believes that parkland can be preserved despite the need for new highways. The Department believes that efficient transportation can be provided without making our landscapes ugly.

The Department believes that your time is worth a great deal, and we therefore intend to do something about clogged highways and airport traffic jams. The Department believes that your lungs deserve something better than smog and that your ears need not be subjected endlessly to shrieking transportation noise.

Among the most serious and most urgent problems which confront the nation today is the problem of the city. In the 20th Century, our cities are in many ways the heart of our nation, but our cities are diseased and troubled. If we as a nation fail to cure the social and economic diseases of the city, then we place in jeopardy all our advances and all our aspirations -- not only in transportation, but in all areas of our national life.

For those reasons, I would like to talk for a few moments about urban transportation -- the thorny, complex problem of moving people and goods in and around cities.

Someone has said that New York City could solve most of its transportation problems in a matter of hours if the city were willing to take a single, daring step -- that is, make the George Washington bridge one way. Then, overnight, all of New York's traffic problems would be exported to New Jersey.

But that solution, however simple, is unrealistic. Urban transportation problems, like urban problems in general, are complex -- complex legally, complex financially, complex socially. What are the problems of urban transportation?

Well, there is the problem of the commuter -- of moving millions of people every day from the suburbs to the cities and back again. We are concerned about this. And yet we haven't even figured out how to move people from the front of the bus to the rear.

And there is the problem of transportation for the citizens of the inner city. Mobility is a luxury. It was a luxury almost

(more)

unknown to many of our grandfathers, and it is a luxury virtually unknown today not only in the underdeveloped nations, but also to tens of thousands of Americans who live in urban ghettos.

Mobility broadens horizons and sparks ambitions. For the citizen of the inner city, mobility -- even the short-distance mobility of cheap, simple transportation systems -- can be the key to finding a job and keeping a job. That's a big part of the reason that we're concerned about urban transportation.

A lot of people are thinking and talking these days about what's wrong with cities. It all boils down to easily recognized defects. We need more parks and trees. Too many of our people live in squalor. The schools teach, but too many do not educate. The bus service is not adequate. The freeway spoils the view. The planes taking off from the airport are noisy. And we did not leave any place for people to walk in the sun.

One of our problems in attacking these deficiencies is that our efforts have been fragmented. Some want rapid transit. Some want stricter planning. Others argue that the only answer is to get the highways out of the cities. Indeed, the very multiplicity of our urban transportation problems hampers our search for solutions.

We are in much the same situation as the New England contractor who, some years ago, won a bid to construct a new school. The school board wanted the job done as economically as possible, and with as little inconvenience as possible to the students. So the school board placed two conditions in the contract. First, the contractor had to tear down the old school and use the salvaged materials on the new one. And second, he had to let the students use the old school until the new one was built.

We can't wait for our cities to be torn down and rebuilt. We've got to use the materials and the resources at hand. This is what President Johnson is seeking to do with the broad range of urban programs his Administration has begun. The model cities program, aid to education, economic development activities including the War on Poverty, the comprehensive crime control program -- all these are elements of a total attack on the urban problem. Even the President's proposal for a tax surcharge is related to the problems of the city, and -- in realistic terms -- I can tell you why.

Because of our international commitments, if we do not get the tax surcharge the President has requested, we will not be able to hold the line against inflation. And always in inflationary times, the heaviest burdens fall on the poor and the old, most of whom live in cities. Let's look at what the surcharge would do, and at what inflation would do without the surcharge.

A family of four with an income of $5,000 would pay nothing under President Johnson's surcharge plan, but it would pay an estimated $147 a year for inflation without the surcharge.

A family with an income of $10,000 would pay $174 more in taxes if the surcharge went into effect, but it would pay $258 for inflation.

And a family with earnings of $20,000 would pay $316 for inflation -- $224 more than under the surtax plan.

In the Department of Transportation, we're optimistic about what we may be able to do to help curb inflation.

In my own Office of International Affairs and Special Programs we have begun -- with the enthusiastic help of the transportation industry -- an attack on the red tape associated with cargo movements. If goods can be moved less expensively, then everyone will profit. We have also begun efforts internationally to establish programs for the exchange of transportation technology. Our view is that if a Western European nation, for example, has perfected a new transportation device or system, why should we spend precious dollars to acquire the same know-how when we can instead work out an exchange agreement which would benefit everyone?

In the Department, we're optimistic also about what we can contribute to the concerted attack on urban problems. An interesting example is an experimental highway program under way in Baltimore. A 23-mile stretch of Interstate 95 will be designed there not by highway engineers working in a vacuum, but by a complete team of engineers, architects, urban planners and others who specialize in the life of cities. Baltimore wants more than just a busy trafficway. It wants a highway that is an attractive but still useful part of the city. And the Department is contributing $4.8 million dollars to the effort not simply to please Baltimoreans, but because we think it may well set a worthy pattern for the design of urban highways across the nation.

There are other examples. There's a program called TOPICS, which looks toward the more efficient use of existing city streets. There are plans to reserve certain lanes of freeways for the exclusive use of buses. There's the Northeast Corridor project -- a systems approach to transportation in megalopolis. The high-speed trains which will soon be operating are only a part of that project.

I hope the businessmen of the Delaware Valley will share our concern about urban transportation, just as I hope you will assist us in our efforts to eliminate unnecessary barriers

to the domestic and the international transportation of America's products. I hope you will help us find solutions to some of the problems of trade, such as:

-- Why should we require a manufacturer to complete yards of forms before he can ship his products abroad?

-- Why do we tolerate a system which makes it impossible for a carrier to quote a single-factor rate for shipping goods from an American city to, say, a city in Western Europe?

-- And why do we allow uncoordinated Federal bureaus to insist on inflicting nomenclature chaos and incompatible rate structures on a helpless shipping public.

Those are artificial barriers to transportation and trade. Unfortunately, some members of Congress have been thinking recently about some additional artificial barriers. The current resurgence of protectionism in Washington is of great concern to us in the Department of Transportation, for we believe it runs counter to the direction in which the world's greatest and most successful trading nation -- the United States -- should be headed.

The trouble with import quotas, applied unilaterally, is that they backfire -- they spread; and there's no telling who all might suffer. One nation erects a barrier against imports of one kind of commodity, and other nations reply with barriers of their own against other commodities.

International trade is no longer just a two-way street. It is a busy freeway. And we who are in the transportation business know that when you close off a freeway, you invite disorder and dislocation all over town.

I could go on talking for a long time about transportation problems and their possible solutions, but if I did so I might run the risk of being called an idealist -- perhaps, heaven forbid, a fanatic. A fanatic, you know, has been described as someone who redoubles his efforts after losing sight of his goals.

I will say that in the Department of Transportation, our realism is guided by some ideals. We're not ashamed to say so. Nehru, the great leader of India, once commented that "Most advocates of realism in this world are hopelessly unrealistic." We in the Department wouldn't want to be so ploddingly realistic as to be accused of that.

# # #

HQ-610 100.5

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A CONVOCATION OF LEWIS AND CLARK COLLEGE, PORTLAND, OREGON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, AT 9 A.M.

In Washington a few weeks ago the American Institute of Planners sponsored a conference on the subject "The Next Fifty Years, the Future Environment of a Democracy." The meeting included several searching discussions, and I think it's a good thing the meeting was held in Washington. We bureaucrats are confronted by philosophers far too infrequently.

One of the papers presented at the conference was written by Carl Oglesby of Antioch College and was entitled "The Young Rebels." Oglesby set the stage for his discussion with this opening sentence: "The post-war generations are leading an attack on the moral confidence of an America whose materialism had seemed boundless and unshakeable." What he means there is that young people -- you people -- are challenging the standards which we older people have devised -- or more likely, which we simply accepted.

It may be a serious challenge. It is at least a curious one, I think. In the demonstrations and the eccentricities of young people today, there is a broad streak of nihilism. But is is a nihilism with a strong moral quality -- a nihilism in which Christ is a hero. Forgive us old-fashioned fuddy-duddies if we have difficulty understanding you.

Forgive us also, please, if we decide sometimes simply to ignore you. It may be because in truth, we are more concerned about the idealism of young people than about their delinquency.

OCT 30 RECD

(more)

00108

FR
1074

AGGEDG-6/1027 2/25/69 FAA-S#1

From reading newspapers and trying to understand the lyrics of the rock music I hear on the radio, I would assume that the attack on the nation's moral confidence goes at least somewhat beyond J. D. Salinger's Holden Caulfield. I, for one, wonder precisely what's happening in young America. That suggests that instead of talking to you this morning, I should be listening to what you would have to say to me.

Mr. Oglesby, in his paper on "The Young Rebels," contrasted your situation with that of your fathers and mothers. A man in his forties today was born during the 1920's. He was 10 years old when the Depression hit bottom. His future was uncertain. And when the Depression was over, he saw war and conflict threatening to destroy Europe and the Far East.

In contrast, let me quote Mr. Oglesby on the predicament of today's young person:

"He is the first heir of the American dream come really and finally true. A product of generations whose lives were taken by an extreme social insecurity and a labor of the grandest historical moment, he may seem by comparison to be, in one word, useless. He has everything the country can offer. He knows how to be educated and how to hold a professional job, how much money he will earn, what kind of house and neighborhood he can expect to live in. He will never be hungry or disgraced. What new toys his high-flying technological culture is about to invent, he will possess; they will have been invented for him. Certain tables of social statistics even allow him to predict with impressive accuracy how long he will live, when he will suffer from his first ulcer or heart attack, and when his wife will be unfaithful to him for the first time. If the parent generation was the one which knew nearly nothing about its future, his is the one which knows nearly everything. Nothing moves is his scientifically preconditioned air. Everything lies still for him and invites him to have fun and be a good consumer.

"In brief, his situation is desperate. He will produce the highest suicide rate the West has seen."

Is that, then, your destiny? To produce the most impressive suicide rate? I cannot say with any certainty that it isn't your destiny. I can say that lying about here and there within our society are some pretty big problems whose solutions just might be worth living for and working toward.

When I was a senior in law school, I thought a lot about what I wanted to do for a living; and without much difficulty, I ranked according to their status the professions which might be open to me.

At the top of my list was teaching, or at least academic research. That seemed an extremely noble undertaking. Number Two was government service in an important, front-page area -- say in the State Department. Third was government service of a more pedestrian nature.

(more)

Fourth was a job in a Washington law firm -- a "policy-oriented firm," as we lawyers like to say. Fifth was a Wall Street law firm. Sixth was to be counsel to a corporation. And seventh -- at the lowest point on my schedule of status job opportunities -- was working for a corporation in a non-legal job. It just didn't seem a very noble thing to do.

And so what do I think today -- 17 years later? Well, I could say I've turned the list upside down. But that wouldn't be true. I've simply torn it up.

I've decided that for the individual -- from the point of view of the man doing the job -- there is no moral superiority in any of the so-called "nobler" professions. I've been in and out of government and in and out of business, and I've even done a little teaching. And today, being a public servant, I'm excited about public service. But that doesn't mean that as a category, I think it's superior to anything. As a matter of fact, it's my view that one has to serve in government -- perhaps any government -- to know how unacceptable is the idea of extending the authority of government.

There are businessmen and bureaucrats with a sense of duty and a sense of workmanship, just as there are teachers and preachers with those attitudes. And may their tribe increase. But I can also report that the demands of tenure and sluggishness and -- forgive me -- campus politics can be just as bad in government as they can be in the world of business. Having said that, perhaps I should fly to New York tonight and start looking for that job in a Wall Street law firm.

This was supposed to have been a sort of United Nations Day speech; but as you can see, it isn't turning out quite that way. I thought for a long time about what I might be able to say to you about the UN.

Describe its organization? You may well know as much about that as I do.

Describe its achievements and regret its failures? Again, you may know just as much about that as I.

In the context of what I am saying, perhaps I should quote the late Adlai Stevenson. He once said that "The task of the United States Mission to the United Nations is simple: merely to make sure that those 11,000 decisions are compatible with the national interest -- while everyone else is trying to make sure that they are compatible with their national interest."

An impossible job? Of course it's impossible. But that doesn't make it any less necessary -- or, for that matter, any more or less noble. In a way, it is what the UN is and what it has to be in an imperfect world. For it's a messy world we live in, a gray world whose problems know none of the purity of either black or white. The UN is a mechanism for reaching

(more)

unsatisfying, though seldom really unacceptable compromises and accommodations. And in this world, that is something. Indeed, it is quite a lot.

So far this morning I've tried to do two things. I've placed you -- young America -- in an atmosphere which has been "scientifically preconditioned," and I have told you that in my view the noble professions offer you no easy means of escape. So where does that leave us?

Well, it leaves you where most college graduates go anyway. It leaves many of you candidates for what we in government sometimes call "the private sector" -- the world of enterprise for profit. And I submit you're going to find some problems there. The first of those problems has been around for centuries and has been responsible for a lot of moralizing in all directions. The problem is as inescapable as it is commonly ignored. It is this -- that there is a basic conflict between the Christian ethic and the profit motive, between private-enterprise capitalism and man's love for man. The conflict is not a stalemate, but a cause for constant shifting and almost constant scurrying to new positions of rationalization. We have said that what's good for General Motors is good not simply for the country but for mankind in general. We have devised United Funds or Community Chests or whatever you might call them, and we have praised the corporate givers to those charities without really facing up to the question of whether the two dollars or two hundred dollars or two thousand dollars we give is really only an organized and propagandized bribing of an unsettled conscience.

Now in saying such things as these I realize that I may be risking my membership in the investor's club. But I shall insist, when challenged, that I am not making judgments but only identifying questions. They are questions which many of you will face, and they will not be easily settled.

Just this week, the Wall Street Journal published an article about the difficulties American businessmen have in recruiting bright college graduates. One of the key problems is that young people seem to feel that business isn't meeting the requirements of conscience. I believe that whether or not this attitude is valid, it is an attitude which will be changing. For the fact is that there is in corporate America a whole new concept of responsibility to the community. It is reflected in the response to the civil rights revolution, in the growing concern about pollution of air and water -- even, sometimes, in political action led by business executives. The fact that they simply sign full-page advertisements in the New York Times does not make them any less concerned than young people who carry signs in picket lines.

But at this point -- at the point that the corporation assumes a social conscience -- we discover a new problem. Where does the stockholder stand when the board of directors starts passing out dollars to the poor? How does the progressive corporation square its social conscience with its obligation to the stockholder? I don't pretend to know. I doubt that you, either, can state any pat answers. But it may be a more important question than many of the questions which I deal with as a public servant. So far as the quality

of life in our world is concerned, it may be more important than teaching or preaching. And it points to a second question -- whether private enterprise as we know it can stand the pressure of a new generation responsive to moral imperatives.

I said a moment ago that I think business in America is a better citizen than it ever has been. But can it really afford to be all that charitable? Can it afford to clean up the slums? Can it afford to happily tolerate free trade at the possible peril of its domestic markets? Can it afford personalized service when computers are cheaper? Can it afford corporate philanthropy at the expense of stockholders?

Perhaps your answer is a counter-question: "Can it afford not to?" I can say here that I hope free enterprise can meet the challenge, because I happen to believe in it. If nothing else, it has at least worked pretty well for the United States of America. But I realize all the while that that may not be a satisfactory answer for you.

Since I am an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, I suppose I should say something about transportation in America. I'll confine it to urban transportation, which is one of our most difficult problems -- difficult because it is part and parcel of what may be our greatest domestic problem, the problem of the city.

Really, now -- how did we do it? Cities are supposed to be gracious places full of life and vigor and social and economic opportunity. But we've somehow made them dumping grounds -- breeding places for impoverishment; receptacles for pollution. We've let the schools decay along with the neighborhoods. We've let the playgrounds become parking lots and the parks become freeways. In a word, we've made a mess of it.

I can say today that thanks in large measure to President Johnson, the Federal Government is contributing mightily to a massive effort to save this nation's cities. I can say that the Department of Transportation has joined the effort because its leaders, like the President, are concerned about the lives of human beings. I can say we have begun those efforts, but beyond that I suppose I must simply apologize for the mess you're likely to find when you leave this pleasant campus.

You'll find busy freeways, and you'll wonder what neighborhoods were destroyed while they were abuilding. You'll find noise -- say the noise of marvelous airplanes, penetrating the privacy of homes and the sanctity of human consciousness. You'll ask whether it is the natural condition of man to drive an hour and a half back and forth to work each day on nerve-wracking freeways in order to spend eight hours on the job devising new anti-human demons. You'll ask if the automobile is worth the smog -- if the convenience of the subway or the commuter automobile if really worth the loss of dignity.

(more)

I'd like you to know today that some of those questions are already being asked -- in the bureaucracy as well, by golly, as in business. Our answers, I grant you, may sometimes be tentative. We'll be settling for compromises on occasion. We won't get silent airplanes or red-carpet rapid-transit service overnight. But we'll do the best we can, and we'll welcome your help -- whatever line of work you decide upon.

This is said to be the age of specialization. Well, I'll tell you what we need from young America. We need specialists who are willing, after their specialization, to become generalists again. We need highway engineers who understand what the sociologists are saying. We need urban planners who understand that you sometimes have to get by with less than leveling entire neighborhoods.

We need economists who are capable of thinking like poets, and analysts who will admit that numbers cannot always be assigned to personal values. We need business executives who are not too busy to read an occasional essay on what's happening to America, and we need all kinds of people who are capable of becoming busy enough to pass up an occasional coffee break.

Someone has joked that it's a good thing the wheel was invented before the automobile, because if it hadn't been, can you imagine the awful screeching. It's all a matter of priorities, we say. First things first. But I wonder if we don't translate that too often to read first things only -- to mean my little office, my little department, my little piece of the action is my only concern.

A couple of years ago a poet named Randall Jarrell died an early death. I don't know how much Randall Jarrell you read in literature classes at Lewis and Clark College, but I hope you read some.

At any rate, some months ago another poet -- Karl Shapiro -- went to the Library of Congress in Washington and gave a memorial lecture about Jarrell. It's a lecture that has fascinated me -- partly, I guess, because it rejects a lot of the literary clichés about poets and poetry. Let me read you some Karl Shapiro, on Randall Jarrell:

> "It comes to the fact that America the Mother wants to love her children but is much more successful at killing them off, or just making them successful. Jarrell had a brilliant, sure, and subtle mind, and would have been the greatest poet since whoever the last great poet was, had he not lacked the sense of power. . . He came of a generation that could not hate Mother America but which was afraid of her and for her. . . He recoiled from the boredom and the horror and the glory of the day-to-day life. But what he did in his poetry, which had never really been done before, was to face the modern scene and to -- what more is there to say -- to face it. He faced the music of the American Way of Life. . . Jarrell was split between his heart and mind. He was modern, which means hating being modern."

(more)

It is modern to hate being modern. It's a hell of a lot easier to be afraid of computers than to like them. And trying to establish professional purpose where there may not have been any is a damned sight more difficult than freaking out.

I guess all I really want to say this morning is that the nation needs young people who can face the music of the American way of life.

And bring your conscience with you. It's not nearly as terrifying as your electric guitar. Thanks.

# # #

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C., 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND, AT THE IMPERIAL HOTEL, PORTLAND, OREGON, OCTOBER 27, 1967, NOON

It is good to be in your fair city. I say that with a great deal of feeling, because I am truly impressed with the way you have used intelligence and ingenuity to make Portland a pleasant place in which to live.

A representative of the Department of Transportation could hardly come to the State of Oregon without commenting on the recent labor dispute in the railroad industry and the part that your Senator Wayne Morse played in the settlement of that dispute. The strike posed grave questions for the nation and its commitments abroad.

One of the special programs in my part of the Department of Transportation is the Office of Emergency Transportation, whose job it is to advise the Secretary on the ramifications of a transportation strike and on appropriate contingency plans.

It is a possible job, but an extremely difficult one. You can imagine that in the rail dispute, the Department was most happy that it did not have to invoke the emergency powers which the President had given to the Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd. Your Senator Morse was a leading figure both as floor manager in the Senate of the President's bill to solve the labor dispute, and as chairman of the special board which was appointed by the President after the bill became law.

The Senator's job was not easy. As he said, he drew the black bean. But he cooked it well. I can assure you that those of us who were close to the situation appreciated the leadership which Senator Morse provided. He guarded the public interest in this dispute, and his special board has made a notable effort to see to it that the next time such questions arise, the parties involved will have the factson which to base a solution without inviting government intervention in what should be private collective bargaining.

The occasion for our being together is United Nations Day, 1967. That's the occasion for our being together, but I should say at the outset that I do not propose to spend all my time talking about the UN. After all, I come from a new Federal Department that is not yet seven months old; and I am not so charitable -- not even where the United Nations is concerned -- to pass up an opportunity, this far from Washington, to do some missionary work on behalf of my Department.

I will, though, talk about the UN. And then I'd like to talk about an international undertaking we have begun in the Department of Transportation.

In talking about the United Nations, if I may have a text, let it be something which was said by U Thant, the Secretary General of the UN, and which was repeated last month by Arthur Goldberg, the United States Ambassador to the UN.

What they said was this: "It has not been a good year for the United Nations."

The UN did not meet the challenge of aggression in the Far East or the challenge of conflict in the Middle East. It did not solve all problems or head off all disturbances. And I will go a step further. I will say that there are likely to be other bad years for the United Nations -- other failures. Because it is that sort of undertaking.

Let me repeat something else that Ambassador Goldberg said last month when the General Assembly's plenary session opened in New York. He said -- and I quote:

> "In serving the cause of a just and peaceful world, we are not permitted the luxury of being easily discouraged. Indeed, the most forbidding obstacles are precisely those which should call forth our most persistent efforts.
>
> "Nor should we look for any alternative to the United Nations, for there is none."

Adlai Stevenson once said that "The task of the United States Mission to the United Nations is simple: merely to make sure that those 11,000 decisions are compatible with the national interest -- while everyone else is trying to make sure that they are compatible with their national interest."

An impossible job? Of course it's impossible. But that doesn't make it any less necessary. I've always liked what the late Carl Sandburg, the poet, said about the late Mike Quill, the labor leader. He called Quill an "impossiblist."

That, in a way is what the UN is and what it has to be in an imperfect world -- a forum for impossiblists. It's a messy world we live in -- a gray world whose problems know none of the purity of either black or white. And that's what the UN is all about. It's a mechanism for reaching unsatisfying, though seldom really unacceptable compromises and accommodations.

But the UN is more than that. If it has failed to keep the peace in some instances, it has kept the peace in others. If its humanitarian projects have not solved the problems of the world, they have helped millions. If it has been paralyzed at times, it has seemed remarkably energetic at others.

On the occasion of United Nations Day, I think it is good to remember that the UN is not simply that gathering place for diplomats in New York. It is also the World Health Organization. It is also the Food and Agriculture Organization. It is also UNESCO -- the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

In the Department of Transportation, we work daily with still other specialized agencies of the United Nations. Among them are IMCO -- the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization -- and ICAO -- the International Civil Aviation Organization. Organizations such as these are proud, vital parts of the UN organization. They are solving problems every day. They are not solving the largest problems. But in the end, it may be those smaller solutions that have laid the foundations for the kind of world we would like to build.

I don't know whether you ever read Murray Kempton, the newspaper columnist in New York. A few years ago he put together a collection of some of his columns and published them in a book. And he entitled the book, "America Comes of Middle Age."

I suppose that what Mr. Kempton meant by that was that he thinks that as a Nation, we have lost some of our vigor. The United Nations is 22 years old. I don't know when someone is going to write a book called "The United Nations Comes of Middle Age."

I hope it won't be soon. If there is an organization in the world today that needs vigor -- if there is an organization that needs the endurance qualities that we associate with youth -- it is the United Nations.

I suppose that before I continue, I should acknowledge to you that the United States Department of Transportation may not seem to some of you to be as important or as interesting an organization as the United Nations.

There are two ways of describing an organization -- by what it is, and by what it does. In our case, the Department of Transportation is such a new thing that we are forced sometimes to tell about it by saying what we plan to do.

The Department is the Federal Aviation Administration, the Coast Guard, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railway Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, and the National Transportation Safety Board. All of these agencies are grouped under a Secretary whose job it is to regard transportation as a system -- not as different kinds of vehicles running off in all directions, but as members of a team.

In one sense, the formation of a Department of Transportation could be regarded as an upgrading of transportation concern in Washington -- a recognition, if you will, of the importance of transportation to the life of the nation.

But in another sense, the Department is a recognition that transportation is, after all, a servant -- and ought to be a better one; that the way to make transportation a better servant is to make it more efficient and more responsive to actual needs.

In my own Office of International Affairs and Special Programs, we have begun several efforts. One of them is facilitation -- transportation facilitation, the whole business of trying to help people and goods move more facilely and more efficiently, especially as they move from one mode of transportation to another -- from the railroad to the ship; or, for that matter, simply through those long waiting lines at the airport.

Another is International Industrial Cooperation. We're going to try to work out agreements whereby the transportation technology developed in other nations can be utilized in this country in return for American transportation technology which might be useful abroad. We see opportunities here for mutual savings of both time and money. And time is important. Our urban transportation problems, for example, simply will not wait.

Another office is our Office of International Transportation. These are the people who will be working with international organizations such as IMCO and ICAO. We live in a small world -- a world in which distance is measured by time. It isn't 3,000 miles from Portland to Washington; it's six hours. In that kind of world, transportation coordination in our international concerns is at least as important as coordination in our domestic affairs.

The office I want to talk for a few moments about is our Office of Technical Assistance.

The Agency for International Development in the State Department is the agency of government responsible for carrying out this nation's technical assistance programs. In our own Department, we have established an Office of Technical Assistance which, we hope, will become a valuable advisor to the Agency for International Development.

This office will review transportation projects that might be included in the nation's foreign assistance programs. It will seek to apply to those proposals the same standards of economy, the same standards of coordination and orderliness that we believe should apply to public transportation expenditures in the United States.

We do not intend to help each developing nation build quickly a full-scale transportation system. There will be times when we will argue that a specific nation should be encouraged not to buy a fleet of airplanes, or build a superhighway, or construct a new port.

We're not in the business of transportation for its own sake. We do not propose that technical assistance for transportation be a running faucet on the Federal Treasury. We want to assure that what money is spent is spent sensibly. We will not propose to string concrete ribbons through the steaming jungles when what is really needed is a system of intercoastal waterways.

With the right kind of planning, and the right kind of priorities, we think many of these nations can escape some of the transportation mistakes that the developed nations -- including the United States -- have made in the building of their transportation systems.

Tony Solomon, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, made a speech last month in Peru on the subject of the economic integration of Latin America. He pointed out that the nations of Latin America have committed themselves to the creation of a Common Market, and he

asked what are the impediments to that goal?

I think it is significant that the first item on Mr. Solomon's list, the first impediment, was transportation -- what he called "the obvious physical obstacle: the poorly developed transportation and telecommunications network both within and between the countries of Latin America."

He said: "The arteries of Latin America lead to coastal ports, not to neighboring countries. The oceans connect the countries of Latin America with Europe and the United States, and the mountains divide them from each other. So too with communications. It is easier to make a telephone call from Costa Rica to New York than to make a call to neighboring Managua, Nicaragua."

Mr. Solomon says that the physical disunity of Latin America can be overcome, "in time," as roads and railroads and plane connections are developed and as new means of communications are devised. What Mr. Solomon's comments say to me is this -- that hereafter, when we consider Latin American proposals in the Office of Technical Assistance of the Department of Transportation, we have a new factor for our equations.

Economic integration is a Latin American goal which is supported by the United States as a matter of national policy. Therefore, it is our responsibility to help see to it that Latin American transportation projects which are approved for technical assistance are compatible with that goal. On that basis, a project aimed at regional transportation development for the benefit of a group of nations could acquire enough new value to make it of higher priority than, for example, a project linking the capital of a single nation with a port on its coast.

What I am saying, really, is that in our transportation assistance to developing nations, we should be looking for ways to serve national goals of the United States at the same time that we're simply helping others with their problems.

I'm saying also that the projects may sometimes need to be long-range rather than short-term, even though, in so doing, we may sometimes have to admit to ourselves a lack of certainty about our chances of success.

When the Federal Government agrees to pay 90 percent of the cost of a highway that a state or a group of states wants to build, it's a good bet that the highway will meet certain standards of safety and certain physical standards of quality, and that the highway will stretch from its beginning point to its terminal point.

But when the Government of the United States agrees to help an underdeveloped nation with its problems, there are no such certainties.

Economic development is responsive to certain principles, of course. But as a science of precision, the development of the underdeveloped world leaves a great deal to be desired.

United States assistance to the less-developed countries of the world has had its surprises and frustrations, and there will be others. There is the example of a fine highway which was built in a country of the southern hemisphere to open a fertile, unsettled lowland area not far away. It was anticipated that when the highway was completed, the poor, deprived people of the bleak highlands would migrate to easier and more prosperous lives in the fertile valleys. But the migration did not take place.

It took social scientists many months to extract from the people of the highlands the reasons for their reluctance. Of course, they were not sure about this new life promised them in the lowlands. That was natural.

But it turned out also that they thought that once they left their homes and went down that road, they could never return. It had not occurred to them that the road could be used in both directions.

In another case, a highway was built through the hinterlands so that the impoverished people there would have access to the centers of civilization and to the markets of the urban areas. But before the road was completed, all the inhabitants of the area the highway builders were trying to help had moved away -- into still more remote areas of the country.

Those were transportation projects. They indicate to me that we need more thorough pre-investment studies when we set out to help the less-developed nations improve their transportation systems in the hope of more rapid economic development. And especially, we need the help of competent social scientists -- perhaps I should say sensitive social scientists -- so that we can know with a little more certainty what our goals in any technical assistance undertaking should be. I am aware, though, that I said a little more certainty. There will be no absolute certainty.

I want to go one step further today on this question of technical assistance. I'm going to ask: Why technical assistance, anyway? If it's such a risky game, why do we choose to play?

There are several answers to that question. We are engaged in

assisting the less-developed nations because of something we call man's obligation to man -- because it just doesn't seem right to us that we as a nation are so wealthy when others in other nations are so poor and deprived. And another answer is that we assist other nations in order to serve our own purposes -- to further the goals of the United States.

Are those ideas in conflict? At a glance, they may sometimes seem to be. But I don't think they are, really. In the first place, despite our wealth and our strength, we can't really hope to lift everyone to economic achievement. In the second place, that movement in the world which we have come to call the revolution of rising expectations is happening anyway -- it would be happening, for the most part, with or without the United States of America. And so there's not a question really of whether we're going to stop development or not. There is a question of whether we can have it sometimes come out in our favor.

Technology disturbs things. In our own country, industrialization and the rise of technology have created many social and political problems. Our continuing industrialization led to the development of -- and then contributed to the decay of -- the city. And in turn, the nature of our urbanization is today our primary domestic problem.

In the light of that, are we really entitled to accept, almost as an act of faith, the view that economic and technical development per se for the less-developed areas of the world will bring peace and stability?

I think those are tough questions which demand tough thinking on the part of you and your government. We can be sure that a world split between have's and have-not's will be an unstable world, particularly when there are divisions among the have's -- divisions which lead them to court the underdeveloped areas.

But we cannot assume that technical and economic assistance, even the most massive assistance skillfully administered, will produce a perfectly ordered international society. We should not call upon the aid programs for miracles. And we might as well start with the understanding that we are dealing not simply with less-developed nations, but with human beings.

We can expect them to feel some resentment toward the hand that feeds them. That is part of the nature of a human being. We can expect them to dignify their own position by assuring themselves that we give assistance in what we believe to be our own self-interest. That is, after all, at least in part my view of what we ought to do. We can expect them, in some cases,

to regard our assistance as salve for our own conscience -- as repayment, if you will, for Western colonial policies and trade inequities of the past. And we can expect the less-developed countries -- as they become more developed -- to undergo periods of internal disorder as their societies change.

Several weeks ago President Johnson issued his proclamation designating United Nations Day, 1967. Some of the things he said then are appropriate, I think.

He said that the failures of the UN:

> "Have disheartened those who saw in it the only hope for peace in a world torn by strife. Yet despite those failures, it has achieved much that could not have been achieved without it. It remains the symbol, and the standard, of man's desire to turn away from ancient quarrels and make peace with his neighbor."

The President said also, "The United Nations has no magic formula for solving the increasingly complex problems of our revolutionary age."

I suppose that what I've been saying today is something the President knows better than any of us. Neither does the United States have magic-formula solutions for the problems of a revolutionary age.

I will say that I think your government -- the President, the State Department, the Agency for International Development -- is doing the tough thinking and the earnest work that in this world are the only alternatives to magic formulas.

I will say too that in the new Department of Transportation, the Office of Technical Assistance will try to ask the hard questions, and acknowledge the uncertainties, as it prepares transportation advice for the nation's technical assistance programs.

I think it's an exciting venture -- this Department of Transportation. I hope it, too, will be a long time reaching middle age.

#

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AT THE MADISON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, AT 12:30 P.M.

I'm delighted to be here today to join you -- the members of the Transportation Association of America -- in welcoming Arthur Baylis to an important campaign which I like to call "The Paperwork Rebellion." Even with Art's impressive background in transportation, and even with the active support of members of the National Committee on International Trade Documentation, he has a most challenging task.

Sometimes I look at Robert Blackwell, the Director of our Office of Facilitation in the Department of Transportation, and I realize how overworked Bob is -- he has a staff of four people -- and I think to myself, "How presumptuous can we be?" There are so few of us, and here we are trying to deal with the massive problem of documentation, and with all the other impediments to the movement of our commerce. It's depressing sometimes.

But then I come to a meeting such as this, and I realize that the transportation industry is on our side, and we're on theirs, in the effort to facilitate transportation. And I'm encouraged again.

I know that the President of the United States is on our side. He has referred to the documentation requirements in international trade as "paperwork run wild," and he has directed this Government to do something about it.

I know that the Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, is on our side. He has made clear to me our Department's determination to help carry out the President's directive.

I'm encouraged, too, by the establishment of the new organization whose activities Mr. Baylis is going to direct -- the National Committee on International Trade Documentation.

The NCITD is a good idea -- a joint effort in private industry to lead an attack on the wasteful, expensive documentation requirements associated with international trade. But with Mr. Baylis and his staff on board, I believe NCITD is quickly going to become much more than an idea. And I want you to know that nothing is more heartening to us in the Department of Transportation than the knowledge that shippers and the transportation industry are willing to put serious time and effort and money into the campaign to facilitate transportation and trade.

We in the Department believe that most of the burdens of improving transportation are, and will continue to be, yours. That philosophy was stated clearly by Congress last year in the legislation establishing the Department of Transportation. To a great extent, our job in the Department will be one of trying to get Government out of your way. By coordinating the work of Government agencies, by drafting and promoting legislation, by attacking outmoded and unnecessary inspection and documentation requirements, and by other means, we hope to help you move toward goals of freer travel and more efficient transportation of goods and people.

I'd like to tell you today just a few things about the work of our Office of Facilitation -- specifically, about a program we have begun and about an idea which we find exciting.

You may recall that in mid-September, the Cabinet officers of Japan came to Washington for three days of meetings with the Cabinet officers of the United States on the subject of trade and economic affairs. Several things were agreed to by the officials of the two nations. We think one of the most tangible agreements grew out of a suggestion made by our Secretary Boyd and the Japanese Minister of Transportation, Takeo Ohashi.

It was agreed that a joint panel of ranking Japanese and American officials would be established to study, across a broad front, all methods of facilitating air and sea travel, and cargo movements, between the two nations. Our Office of Facilitation is now enlisting support and cooperation on the United States side. This undertaking will be more than a paper study. We intend to run tests of the available ideas for improving Japanese-American traffic. We're not looking for merely a series of study papers to be published two or three years hence. We want real results based on actual demonstrations at the airports and ports of both nations.

One reason we have undertaken this program is that in 1970 the Japanese will sponsor Expo 70, a major international exposition at Osaka, Japan. This event will attract a great many Americans. By that time we hope we can demonstrate successes that will have made it easier to travel to Japan or move cargoes there.

Japanese interest in this program illustrates the fact that other nations are interested in working with us on the problems of transportation facilitation. It's a well-known fact that many of the nations which are trade and travel partners of the United States are ahead of us in terms of documentation. In the Department of Transportation, we're working on proposals to authorize joint through rates for intermodal shipments -- something a lot of other nations already have. Any dawdling on this score only prolongs the handicap under which the U.S. exporter has to operate. Surely we can apply enough of that good old American ingenuity to catch up with our competitors abroad in the facilitation of transportation.

What do American shippers need? They need a single bill of lading. They need uniform liability assurances, regardless of the kind of transportation they're using. They need joint through rates. They need simple tariff schedules. And they need to be liberated from the piles of documents which have become an intolerable burden on our export trade.

The TAA, the NCITD and, I hope, the DOT can help meet those needs. Working together, we can change the environment of international trade.

Let me tell you about one of the exciting ideas that emerges from those possibilities. Do you know that more than 20 foreign-flag steamship companies now carry freight from the Pacific Coast of the United States to Northern Europe, but that not a single American carrier

is regularly engaged in that trade? Think what we could do for American shippers and American carriers if we could change the regulatory environment in such a way as to make it possible for those goods to move overland across the United States, and then by water across the Atlantic to Europe.

The goods would reach Europe in half the time now required. The business for the railroads, and perhaps the trucking industry, would be completely new business. American-flag steamship carriers serving the East Coast would participate in the traffic for the first time. The whole operation would be less costly, making the American goods more competitive in foreign markets. And at the same time, more of the dollars spent for transportation would remain in American hands.

And now, having called upon you for help in one campaign -- facilitating transportation -- I want to call upon you for help in another. I want to ask you to join the effort to protect this nation from the large number of unfortunate, short-sighted protectionist proposals that are being considered in Congress.

Philosophically, and as a group, those proposals are an attack on the trade-expansion policies which the United States has pursued for a long time. Those policies have played an important role in the economic prosperity we have enjoyed in this country. Those policies of trade expansion are in great measure the foundation upon which the growth of the transportation industry has been based.

I have a proposal today for those of you who are in the transportation business. I'd like to ask you to go back to your office this afternoon and consider just how much of your business -- what percentage of your sales -- is dependent on international trade.

If you figure it out honestly, I think some of you may be surprised at the importance of international trade to your operations. How much of the freight you carry by truck or rail is headed eventually for some foreign country? Or how much of it will be used to support the manufacture of products which will be exported? How many of the international air travelers who buy your tickets are going abroad on business related to their export or import trade?

That familiar cliche about international trade being a two-way street is as meaningful today as it ever was, and it continues to have a special meaning for the transportation industry. If you were an exporter, or if you were a manufacturer who felt that his domestic sales might be threatened by imports, you might look at only one side of that street -- either your sales abroad, or at foreign sales in the United States.

But the transportation industry -- the American transportation industry -- travels on both sides of the street. You carry the exports from the factory to the airport or to dockside -- and often all the way to the importing nation. And with imports, it's the same way. You carry the product from dockside or from the airport to its final destination in the United States.

The manufacturer who exports only a tiny percentage of his total production may not be very concerned about international trade, for he may have very little to lose. But the transporter has a great deal to lose, because he loses in both directions. If you're in the transportation business, I don't have to tell you that your growth is dependent on the growth of trade. Or that international sales offer this nation its greatest opportunity for trade expansion.

It's an obvious truth also that if transportation equipment manufacturers can broaden the base of their sales markets -- if Detroit can sell more vehicles abroad, or if the aerospace industry can sell more airplanes -- then the equipment you buy is going to be cheaper.

We've heard a lot the last several weeks about the coalition of protectionists who have made their views known to Congress. There are proposals to place import quotas on everything from honey to oil, everything from textiles to steel.

I sometimes wonder where is the coalition of American businessmen who have a stake in freer world trade, in increased international exchange. Frankly, I don't think the transportation industry has been energetic enough in making known its interest in international trade.

I was pleased, a few days ago, to note that Stuart Tipton of the Air Transport Association had informed the Senate Finance Committee of the ATA's position on the import quota proposals.

Mr. Tipton said that the airlines are "extremely concerned over recent indications of a possible change toward a more restrictive trade policy for this country. We can anticipate that adoption of new trade barriers by the United States will inevitably result in the adoption of new trade barriers by other countries."

He noted that the jumbo jets are on the way -- the large airplanes capable of transporting 400 or more passengers or more than a hundred tons of cargo.

"Our ability to utilize that capacity will be impaired," Mr. Tipton said, "if the pace of international commerce slackens. The level of our public service, our employment rate, our financial strength -- in short, this industry's commitment to our nation's economic growth -- would be jeopardized by unilateral action of our Government which would attract retaliatory action by other governments."

The story is much the same throughout the transportation industry.

Of course, I realize that the sponsors of the import-quota proposals aren't arguing against international trade as a whole. The problem is that all those smaller arguments -- the arguments for quotas on this or that commodity -- could add up to an assault on the whole of international trade.

We are here today primarily to talk about facilitating international trade, about removing the artificial impediments of excessive documentation requirements. Wouldn't it be paradoxical if we accomplished all our facilitation goals, only to find that international trade had diminished?

Wouldn't it be ironic if we removed the artificial impediments we're dealing with, only to find much of our energy wasted because new artificial impediments had arisen in the form of import quotas in this country and retaliatory trade barriers abroad?

###

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT A MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AT THE MADISON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1967 AT 12:30 P.M.

I'm delighted to be here today to join you -- the members of the Transportation Association of America -- in welcoming Arthur Baylis to an important campaign which I like to call "The Paperwork Rebellion." Even with Art's impressive background in transportation, and even with the active support of members of the National Committee on International Trade Documentation, he has a most challenging task.

Sometimes I look at Robert Blackwell, the Director of our Office of Facilitation in the Department of Transportation, and I realize how overworked Bob is -- he has a staff of four people -- and I think to myself, "How presumptuous can we be?" There are so few of us, and here we are trying to deal with the massive problem of documentation, and with all the other impediments to the movement of our commerce. It's depressing sometimes.

But then I come to a meeting such as this, and I realize that the transportation industry is on our side, and we're on theirs, in the effort to facilitate transportation. And I'm encouraged again.

NOV 2 2 1967

FR1781
00181
AGGE)G 67/120
2/28/69
FAA-S#1

I know that the President of the United States is on our side. He has referred to the documentation requirements in international trade as "paperwork run wild," and he has directed this Government to do something about it.

I know that the Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, is on our side. He has made clear to me our Department's determination to help carry out the President's directive.

I'm encouraged, too, by the establishment of the new organization whose activities Mr. Baylis is going to direct -- the National Committee on International Trade Documentation.

The NCITD is a good idea -- a joint effort in private industry to lead an attack on the wasteful, expensive documentation requirements associated with international trade. But with Mr. Baylis and his staff on board, I believe NCITD is quickly going to become much more than an idea. And I want you to know that nothing is more heartening to us in the Department of Transportation than the knowledge that shippers and the transportation industry are willing to put serious time and effort and money into the campaign to facilitate transportation and trade.

We in the Department believe that most of the burdens of improving transportation are, and will continue to be, yours. That philosophy was stated clearly by Congress last year in the legislation establishing the Department of Transportation. To a great extent, our job in the Department will be one of trying to get Government out of your way. By coordinating the work of Government agencies, by drafting and promoting legislation, by attacking outmoded and unnecessary inspection and documentation requirements, and by other means, we hope to help you move toward goals of freer travel and more efficient transportation of goods and people.

I'd like to tell you today just a few things about the work of our Office of Facilitation -- specifically, about a program we have begun and about an idea which we find exciting.

You may recall that in mid-September, the Cabinet officers of Japan came to Washington for three days of meetings with the Cabinet officers of the United States on the subject of trade and economic affairs. Several things were agreed to by the officials of the two nations. We think one of the most tangible agreements grew out of a suggestion made by our Secretary Boyd and the Japanese Minister of Transportation, Takeo Ohashi.

It was agreed that a joint panel of ranking Japanese and American officials would be established to study, across a broad front, all methods of facilitating air and sea travel, and cargo movements, between the two nations. Our Office of Facilitation is now enlisting support and cooperation on the United States side. This undertaking will be more than a paper study. We intend to run tests of the available ideas for improving Japanese-American traffic. We're not looking for merely a series of study papers to be published two or three years hence. We want real results based on actual demonstrations at the airports and ports of both nations.

One reason we have undertaken this program is that in 1970 the Japanese will sponsor Expo 70, a major international exposition at Osaka, Japan. This event will attract a great many Americans. By that time we hope we can demonstrate successes that will have made it easier to travel to Japan or move cargoes there.

Japanese interest in this program illustrates the fact that other nations are interested in working with us on the problems of transportation facilitation. It's a well-known fact that many of the nations which are trade and travel partners of the United States are ahead of us in terms of documentation. In the Department of Transportation, we're working on proposals to authorize joint through rates for intermodal shipments -- something a lot of other nations already have. Any dawdling on this score only prolongs the handicap under which the U.S. exporter has to operate. Surely we can apply enough of that good old American ingenuity to catch up with our competitors abroad in the facilitation of transportation.

What do American shippers need? They need a single bill of lading. They need uniform liability assurances, regardless of the kind of transportation they're using. They need joint through rates. They need simple tariff schedules. And they need to be liberated from the piles of documents which have become an intolerable burden on our export trade.

The TAA, the NCITD and, I hope, the DOT can help meet those needs. Working together, we can change the environment of international trade.

Let me tell you about one of the exciting ideas that emerges from those possibilities. Do you know that more than 20 foreign-flag steamship companies now carry freight from the Pacific Coast of the United States to Northern Europe, but that not a single American carrier

is regularly engaged in that trade? Think what we could do for American shippers and American carriers if we could change the regulatory environment in such a way as to make it possible for those goods to move overland across the United States, and then by water across the Atlantic to Europe.

The goods would reach Europe in half the time now required. The business for the railroads, and perhaps the trucking industry, would be completely new business. American-flag steamship carriers serving the East Coast would participate in the traffic for the first time. The whole operation would be less costly, making the American goods more competitive in foreign markets. And at the same time, more of the dollars spent for transportation would remain in American hands.

And now, having called upon you for help in one campaign -- facilitating transportation -- I want to call upon you for help in another. I want to ask you to join the effort to protect this nation from the large number of unfortunate, short-sighted protectionist proposals that are being considered in Congress.

Philosophically, and as a group, those proposals are an attack on the trade-expansion policies which the United States has pursued for a long time. Those policies have played an important role in the economic prosperity we have enjoyed in this country. Those policies of trade expansion are in great measure the foundation upon which the growth of the transportation industry has been based.

I have a proposal today for those of you who are in the transportation business. I'd like to ask you to go back to your office this afternoon and consider just how much of your business -- what percentage of your sales -- is dependent on international trade.

If you figure it out honestly, I think some of you may be surprised at the importance of international trade to your operations. How much of the freight you carry by truck or rail is headed eventually for some foreign country? Or how much of it will be used to support the manufacture of products which will be exported? How many of the international air travelers who buy your tickets are going abroad on business related to their export or import trade?

That familiar cliche about international trade being a two-way street is as meaningful today as it ever was, and it continues to have a special meaning for the transportation industry. If you were an exporter, or if you were a manufacturer who felt that his domestic sales might be threatened by imports, you might look at only one side of that street -- either your sales abroad, or at foreign sales in the United States.

But the transportation industry -- the American transportation industry -- travels on both sides of the street. You carry the exports from the factory to the airport or to dockside -- and often all the way to the importing nation. And with imports, it's the same way. You carry the product from dockside or from the airport to its final destination in the United States.

The manufacturer who exports only a tiny percentage of his total production may not be very concerned about international trade, for he may have very little to lose. But the transporter has a great deal to lose, because he loses in both directions. If you're in the transportation business, I don't have to tell you that your growth is dependent on the growth of trade. Or that international sales offer this nation its greatest opportunity for trade expansion.

It's an obvious truth also that if transportation equipment manufacturers can broaden the base of their sales markets -- if Detroit can sell more vehicles abroad, or if the aerospace industry can sell more airplanes -- then the equipment you buy is going to be cheaper.

We've heard a lot the last several weeks about the coalition of protectionists who have made their views known to Congress. There are proposals to place import quotas on everything from honey to oil, everything from textiles to steel.

I sometimes wonder where is the coalition of American businessmen who have a stake in freer world trade, in increased international exchange. Frankly, I don't think the transportation industry has been energetic enough in making known its interest in international trade.

I was pleased, a few days ago, to note that Stuart Tipton of the Air Transport Association had informed the Senate Finance Committee of the ATA's position on the import quota proposals.

Mr. Tipton said that the airlines are "extremely concerned over recent indications of a possible change toward a more restrictive trade policy for this country. We can anticipate that adoption of new trade barriers by the United States will inevitably result in the adoption of new trade barriers by other countries."

He noted that the jumbo jets are on the way -- the large airplanes capable of transporting 400 or more passengers or more than a hundred tons of cargo.

"Our ability to utilize that capacity will be impaired," Mr. Tipton said, "if the pace of international commerce slackens. The level of our public service, our employment rate, our financial strength -- in short, this industry's commitment to our nation's economic growth -- would be jeopardized by unilateral action of our Government which would attract retaliatory action by other governments."

The story is much the same throughout the transportation industry.

Of course, I realize that the sponsors of the import-quota proposals aren't arguing against international trade as a whole. The problem is that all those smaller arguments -- the arguments for quotas on this or that commodity -- could add up to an assault on the whole of international trade.

We are here today primarily to talk about facilitating international trade, about removing the artificial impediments of excessive documentation requirements. Wouldn't it be paradoxical if we accomplished all our facilitation goals, only to find that international trade had diminished?

Wouldn't it be ironic if we removed the artificial impediments we're dealing with, only to find much of our energy wasted because new artificial impediments had arisen in the form of import quotas in this country and retaliatory trade barriers abroad?

###

00181

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY DONALD G. AGGER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE KIWANIS CLUB OF MEMPHIS, AT THE SHERATON-PEABODY HOTEL, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1967, NOON.

It's a real pleasure for me to be in Memphis, although I find that I've come at precisely the wrong time - too early for the Liberty Bowl, and too late for the Duck Hunt.

Today, in just a few short hours, I've experienced one of the wonders of modern-day transportation. I had breakfast in Washington. I had a coffee break high in the air over the Blue Ridge Mountains. Lunch in Memphis, and luggage in Atlanta.

Flying to Memphis this morning, I was reminded, as I always am, of the part transportation has played in making this great nation of ours a nation in the real sense of the word. For the fact is that no longer are we North and South, or New England and Midwest, or Northwest and Southwest.

We're the United States, bound together in spirit by common goals and ideals, and bound together physically by transportation. I think that this unity - this nationhood - is one of the things that makes our country unique in this world.

When you look at the size of our nation, it's hard to believe that we are, in spirit as well as in fact, one nation. Look at France, which is much smaller. It's really dozens of countries - one for each cheese, if you will. And look at little England. It's England, and it's Ireland, and it's Scotland.

Actually, I suppose there are two things which have united us - our communications systems, and our transportation. We are the masters of the mass communication of ideas. We have nationwide radio, television, the Associated Press and United Press International; and so all of us in the United States are invited to purchase the same products and read the same news and enjoy the same entertainment.

But what really unites us, I believe, is transportation - specifically, highway transportation. Mobility is a luxury in most countries. But in our country, with our highways, it has been the luxury of the little man.

Mobility is a source of excitement in the otherwise humdrum routine of our lives. We can take the family and move to California, or we can get in the car and go to Reelfoot Lake to spend Saturday fishing.

The railroads opened the West, and airplanes have made travel almost unbelievably easy. But we had a Civil War after we had railroads, and I don't think we could have a Civil War today. Don't let anyone tell you the trains or airplanes gave us our unity. It was the highway - the magic carpet of the American people.

But you obviously didn't invite me here to listen to a non-historian's lecture on the history of transportation. What I'd like to do today is tell you something about this new thing we've got going in Washington - this Department of Transportation.

I sometimes feel that our Department is a captive of Southerners. The Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, is a native of Florida. The Under Secretary, Everett Hutchinson, is a native of Texas. The Deputy Under Secretary, Paul Sitton, was born in Georgia. One of my fellow Assistant Secretaries, Cecil Mackey, is from Alabama.

And, of course, I'm sure that my accent has made it obvious to you that I also am from the South - southern New York State. I was born in a little place called New York City.

The Department of Transportation was established April 1, just about eight and a half months ago; so I think I can assure you that we're still young enough to be dynamic, and young enough not to be too set in our bureaucratic ways.

I hope it will be a long time before we get to be like the management of a railroad I once heard about. Call it the Consolidated and Amalgamated Railroad. There was a Mr. Smith who took an overnight trip on the Consolidated and Amalgamated. He went Pullman, and he slept well.

But when he awoke the next morning he had welts all over him. He'd been eaten up by bedbugs. So he fired off a bitter letter, and in a few days he got back a reply from the president of the railroad.

"Dear Mr. Smith," the letter began: "We at Consolidated and Amalgamated are distressed beyond words at what happened to you on one of our cars. Please accept, if you can, my most earnest apologies. I want you to know that as a result of what happened, two superintendents and two porters have been fired. We have stripped the car in which you traveled and burned the linen. I think I can assure you that such a thing would not happen again. Sincerely" - and the letter was signed by the company president.

Well, Mr. Smith felt a little better. But there was something else in the envelope. A secretary at the railroad had made a mistake and sent back to Mr. Smith the letter that he had written. And scribbled across the bottom were these words: "Send him the bedbug letter."

There's a theory of government - a theory which I think has some merit - which holds that all government agencies ought to be disbanded every five years, or every 10 years at the most.

I was wondering the other day, what would we in the Department of Transportation be like - what would we be doing - if we knew that four and a half years from now the Department would be out of business? Frankly, I think we'd be doing just about what we're doing now. For I think many of the things we're trying to do are overdue, and I hope we can demonstrate some achievements in a relatively short time.

For the most part, the Department of Transportation is a grouping together of certain transportation agencies which already existed in the Federal Government - the Federal Aviation Administration; the United States Coast Guard; the Federal Highway Administration, which includes the Bureau of Public Roads; the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; the Federal Railroad Administration; the National Transportation Safety Board.

This afternoon I'll be meeting with some of the Department of Transportation people who are located in Memphis - Mr. B. D. Alexander, the area manager of the Federal Aviation Administration; Commander Mortensen of the Coast Guard; Mr. Vincent of the Rail Administration and Mr. Fitzpatrick of the Highway Administration.

One of the things we'll do is look for ways that these people and their organizations can cooperate more closely in the Memphis area - ways that they can coordinate their transportation activities in the same way that we're trying to coordinate Federal transportation activities in Washington and throughout the nation.

The theory behind the Department of Transportation is remarkably simple, and remarkably sensible. The theory is that the time has come in this country when we need to stop thinking of ships and airplanes and trains and trucks and cars as unrelated objects running off in all directions.

What we need to do is think of transportation as a system - as a device, or a team of devices, for getting a shipment of goods or a load of passengers from point A to point B.

I don't think it matters much to the manufacturer what vehicle his products are carried in, so long as they are transported inexpensively, and safely, and so long as there are no unnecessary delays along the way.

Our job in the Department, then, is to coordinate government transportation responsibilities - to take the same "systems approach" to our activities that I'm sure many of you have adopted in your businesses.

Now I'd like to tell you what the Department of Transportation is not. First, it is not an open faucet on the Federal Treasury.

In fact, I think this Department is going to save money. I think it's going to save money for the United States taxpayer. I think it's going to save money for the shipper - the manufacturer who has merchandise to ship. I think it's going to save money for travelers and for the people who own and operate transportation systems.

In my little corner of the Department we have what we call an Office of Facilitation. It's involved in a wide rnage of programs which we call facilitation -- that is, facilitating the flow of traffic, making it easier and more simple to ship goods or move people.

What we want to do is cut out some of the red tape that restricts transportation in this country; eliminate some of the outdated and unnecessary regulations. For example, I like to think that we're leading a "paperwork rebellion" in the government.

Let me give you some statistics. It's estimated that the total value of United States international trade is $58 billion dollars a year. And do you know what is the estimated cost of the administrative work necessary to support this trade - the cost of preparing documents and processing them? It's a staggering $5 billion.

International market places have become more and more competitive. We simply must reduce the paperwork costs of international trading if we're going to remain competitive. The documentation costs involved in exporting are so high, and the procedures are so complicated, that a great many American manufacturers simply can't afford to get into the export business. If we can slice through that paperwork jungle, the savings will be reflected in increased sales abroad, in more business for our transporters and in an improved balance-of-payments position for the United States.

I've said that the Department of Transportation is not just a new way to spend Federal money. It is also not an effort to supplant private initiative. In fact, we recognize in the Department that one of our biggest jobs is to get government out of the way of transportation - to remove the impediments to transportation, to change the environment so that new ideas and new technology can prosper.

There are other things that the Department of Transportation is not. It is not an effort by Washington to take over the powers which rightfully belong to the states and the localities of America.

Let's look at Memphis. According to your Chamber of Commerce, you have seven bus lines here and 89 motor freight lines. You're served by eight railroads, seven air lines and seven barge lines, and eleven U. S. and Interstate highways pass through here.

I suspect that you know more about how these transportation systems work, and how they could work better, than we in Washington know, or than we could know if we assigned 40 bureaucrats to the job of finding out. There was a time in this country - a time not very long ago - when you could divide political opinion conveniently, and with some accuracy, into two groups.

There were those who thought of the Federal Government as a necessary evil which we needed for delivering the mail and supporting the defense system and very little else. These people felt that Federal initiative ought to be resisted with vigor.

And there were those others who felt that our states and our localities had outlived their usefulness and that only the central Government was equipped to do the really important jobs.

I suppose there are still quite a few people who hold these extreme views. But I don't believe there are as many such people as there once were - or that they are as influential as they once were. Certainly they're not in Washington.

A lot of the old advocates of Federal effort have come to understand that Federal programs - regardless of how well thought out they are, or how amply financed - Federal programs cannot succeed unless they mesh with and are supported by the states and the local governments.

And on the other side, a lot of people who used to talk with perhaps a little too much feeling about states' rights have started thinking also about states' responsibilities; about making government at all levels serve the people - the big people and the little people, the rich and the poor, and the black and the white. Many Americans have come to realize, I think, that some of our nation's domestic problems are so massive, so widespread, that they are legitimately of national, rather than purely local, concern.

In short, I think we have come to understand our Federal system better than we ever did, and I think we're beginning to use it in the right way.

Some people call this effort "creative Federalism." Not Federal Government-ism, but Federalism in the sense of a group of proud, vital states and communities working together in a proud and vital nation.

I would remind you of something President Johnson said early this year in his State of the Union Address:

"Federal energy is essential. But it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among Federal, State and local governments can succeed. The test of that partnership will be the concern of each public organization, each private institution, and each responsible citizen."

We in the Department of Transportation are convinced that we can't make transportation decisions for Memphis, or for the State of Tennessee, or for the South. We think you should make those decisions, and we feel that way not simply because we want to abide by any constitutional niceties.

We think you should make those decisions because you are best equipped to make them - because you know what will make your commerce thrive and what will make your people's lives more meaningful; because you know what makes the cotten sell and what brings in industry, and because you know how you want to lead your lives - how you want to get to work in the morning and how much traffic noise, how many freeways, you're willing to tolerate.

But many local areas, if they want to make their own decisions, and if they want to make good decisions, are going to have to equip themselves better for the demands of decision-making. And it's becoming clear, too, that more and more, government decisions are going to have to be responsive to the demands of the people - all of the people, including those who have been outside the decision-making process. They must be brought in.

Secretary Boyd spoke about this a few days ago. He said we've got to quit asking our governors and our mayors to operate under outmoded and fragmented jurisdictional arrangements, with inadequate financing, and often without the authority to make decisions.

And he said that we are going to have to give our citizens - usually through their elected officials - a much greater voice in the transportation choices that so deeply affect their lives.

This is a direction in which we most certainly must move where urban transportation is concerned. Recently we've been hearing a great deal about the so-called "freeway revolts" in some cities. People are saying to the highway builders, "Wait a minute. Are you sure we ought to be running a highway through that park, or through that neighborhood? Are you sure we really need another highway?"

In the Department of Transportation, this sort of controversy gives us trouble, obviously. But we think the freeway revolts are healthy things. They have forced not only Washington, but also the state capitols and the city halls, to do some new thinking - some new thinking, for example, about values which cannot be measured in cost-benefit formulas.

In Memphis, you have been faced with a tough decision about whether you will route an interstate highway through Overton Park. Obviously, statistics and financial reports don't tell the full story of what is at stake there. It is because of this that Lowell Bridwell, the Federal Highway Administrator, plans to come to Memphis in the next few weeks to see for himself what is at stake and what the alternatives might be.

Last week, when I was reading about Memphis and preparing for this trip, one of the things that impressed me most was the fact that on four separate occasions, your city has been honored as the Nation's Cleanest City. That is a real achievement, because it reflects a pride and a community spirit that obviously isn't restricted to cleanliness.

One of the things I find most striking about the South - about the New South, the Memphis kind of South, if you will - is that you are free of many of the massive urban problems to be found elsewhere in the nation. I hope that as you continue to grow and to prosper, you will take advantage of the urban transportation mistakes which too many cities have made. Your happy advantage is that you can plan ahead, and you can meet your problems with technology that was unknown a few years ago, and with outside help that only recently has become available.

In the Department of Transportation, our job is not to tell you what the answers to your problems are.

Our job is to find out from you what your problems are, and how we can help you find the answers.

And if we should ever send you a bedbug letter, scribble a nasty note at the bottom and send it right back.