

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

McClellan - Okay, will hold hearings himself and expedite.

Jackson - For the proposal; questioned whether it will cost more money.

Ervin - Non-committal.

Gruening - Okay.

Muskie - Sounds pretty good, but warns that Senators will be concerned about rol
of certain existing agencies such as FAA, after transfer to new Dept. 2/17

Ribicoff - All the way with us

Harris - Open mind. 2/18

Kennedy - Thinks this is the right approach but wants to make sure we have
studied Jim Landis' report on transportation to President Kennedy.
He thinks there are some reservations in that report that should
be taken into consideration.

Metcalf - Wholeheartedly in favor of new Department, but makes no final
commitment. Wants assurance the new Department will not
hurt the Corps of Engineers.

Montoya - No commitment. 3/1

REPUBLICANS

Mundt - No preconceived notions. Railroads and truckers have been to
see him and advised him "to watch out for this one." Mundt
says, however, he sees nothing in the President's proposal, as
described to him over the telephone, which would affect
adversely either railroads or truckers, latter of which is
important to South Dakota.

Curtis - Open-minded. Doesn't know how people of Nebraska may react.

Javits - Favors new Department BUT insists that President decide now
how mass transit is to be handled. Javits said it should be
assigned to the new Department and the new Secretary should
be a big city man. Don't leave the issue up in the air, he said.
"This is as hot as a pistol." 2/17

Simpson - Makes a lot of sense. Okay. 2/28

Other Senators:

DEMOCRATS

Inouye - Okay 2/18

Randolph - No commitment 2/18

REPUBLICANS

Cooper - Non-committal 2/18

Pearson - okay. 2/28

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

Dawson - Favorably disposed toward the President's proposals, but just beginning to think about them.

Holifield - Will go along; expects to handle the bill himself; wants to be informed of any jurisdictional problem among House Committees and the attitude of outside interests. Will offer Staggers and Garmatz both an early opportunity to testify or make statements.

Brooks - Most enthusiastic.

Fountain - Has not had time to consider carefully, but his natural reaction is against setting up new Department.

Hardy - General aspects make sense, but wants more details.

Blatnik - In full agreement with proposal. 2/25

Jones - (Alabama) Will go along. (He talked to the President while we were in his office)

Garmatz - Questions advisability of moving Maritime to new Department. Leans toward view that Maritime should be handled separately, that it does not fit into an overall Department of Transportation. He will take considerable convincing. He expressed concern that the fate of Maritime in a Department under a Secretary who might be "air oriented."

Moss - Makes no positive commitment but appears favorable. Feels that Government Operations will approve the new Department.

Fascell - Has a favorable impression.

Reuss - Has reservations; opposed to proliferation of new Departments, but is open to "persuasion."

Monagan - Off hand, it sounds pretty good.

Macdonald - Persistent efforts have failed to bring a response. 3-1-66

Roush - First reaction is favorable. Must show that it will improve efficiency and that planning in transportation can be carried forward on a more solid basis.

Moorhead - Leans favorably to new Department but wants to know what will happen to mass transit and how urban transportation will be affected by creation of the new Department.

Gallagher - Makes sense

Randall - Opposed to new Department; against "pyramiding up." Voted against HUD. He said he won't fight us or "make noise," however.

Department of Transportation
House Government Operations Committee (continued)

DEMOCRATS (continued)

- Rosenthal - Okay
- Wright - Expressed reservations about new Department, particularly effect on inland waterways. Wanted to know Administration position on user charges and what criteria the new Secretary of Transportation would impose on navigation projects.
- St. Germain - Non-committal 3/1
- King - (Utah) Promises to keep an open mind. Points out that he has voted with the Administration 98 percent of the time, that that a recent survey of political opinion in his State shows problems. He voted against HUD and therefore inclines against the new Department. "I must vote more conservatively this year."
- Dow - Inclination is to favor the new Department
- Helstoski - Okay.

REPUBLICANS

- Dwyer - Concerned that proposed new department is a piecemeal effort like HUD. Suggests advisability of study of broad reorganization of government, like the Hoover Commission. She expresses an "uneasy feeling" that new department would "end in confusion." She also inquired about role of mass transit. 2/28
- Griffin - Out of town; temporarily unreachable. 3/1
- Reid - (New York) All for it
- Horton - Generally favorable; wants further details. 2/18
- Rumsfeld - No opinion. Questions why mass transit is not included in new Dept. 3/1
- Dickinson - No comment right now. 2/28
- Erlenborn - No immediate reaction. 2/18
- Callaway - Open mind. 2/24
- Wylder - New Department should include regulatory functions as well. Favors unification. 2/28
- Dole - No idea yet. 2/28
- Brown - (Ohio) Concerned about loss of independence of some agencies. 3/1

ICC

HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

Dawson - No definite comment; probably okay. 3/1

Holifield - Will go along

Brooks - Most enthusiastic

Fountain - No opinion. 2/28

Hardy - Okay.

Blatnik - Okay. 2/25

Jones - (Alabama)

Garmatz - Okay.

Moss - No positive commitment but appears favorable.

Fascell - Okay. 2/28

Reuss - No opinion. 3/1

Monagan - "Off hand, no reaction."

Macdonald - Persistent efforts have failed to bring a response. 3-1-66

Roush - No difficulty

Moorhead - Sounds good, but questions whether appointment at discretion of the President would keep the chairman in "fear and trembling."

Gallagher - Will support

Randall - Probably okay. 2/28

Rosenthal - Okay.

Wright - Okay. 3/1

St. Germain - Non-committal. 3/1

King - (Utah)

Dow - No opinion

Helstoski - Okay.

REPUBLICANS

Dyer - No problem, but must keep regulatory agencies independent.

Griffin - Out of town and temporarily unreachable. 3/1

Reid - (New York) Okay

ICC

SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

McClellan - No problem. 2/28
Jackson - Okay
Ervin - Non-committal
Greuning - Enthusiastic for. 2/28
Muskie - Okay. 2/23
Ribicoff - Okay. 2/28
Harris - No opinion. 2/18
Kennedy - No objection to ICC CHAIRMAN being Presidential Appointee.
Metcalf - Enthusiastic for. 2/28
Montoya - No commitment. 3/1

REPUBLICANS

Mundt - Will go along provided there is a fixed term that is not too long. Agrees present system is unsatisfactory.
Curtis - No thoughts
Javits - Sounds like a smart idea. 2/17
Simpson - No thoughts. 2/28

REPUBLICANS (continued)

Horton - Unknown implications. 2/18

Rumsfeld - No thoughts. 3/1

Dickinson - Initially against, but will consider. 2/28

Erlenborn - No particular reaction. 2/18

Callaway - No thoughts. 2/23

Wylder - No harm either way. 2/28

Dole - (Ohio) No judgment. 2/28

Brown - No pre-commitment. 3/1

HIGHWAY SAFETY
SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

- Against use of Trust Fund for financing.
Expressed concern that Federal involvement in vehicle standards might slow down industry's own efforts. 2/24
- Magnuson -
- Pastore - no commitment. 2/21
- Monroney - Generally favorable, but concerned about giving the Secretary discretion to impose safety standards. He should be required to ask Congress for such authority after a two-year study. 3/31
- Lausche - In hospital.
- Bartlett - No opinion re use of Trust Fund, but appears favorable to some kind of safety program. 2/25
- Hartke - So far, non committal. 3/1
- McGee - Okay. 3/1
- Hart - Okay. 3/1
- Cannon - Recognizes necessity of program, but not convinced on degree to which Federal government should get into it. 3/1
- Brewster - In Geneva.
- Neuberger - Favors uniform standards approach with States; favors authority for mandatory safety standards on manufacture of cars. 2/28
- Bass - Safety okay re auto standards. Wants tight restrictions on aid to States. Questions use of Trust Fund, but otherwise okay. 2/28

REPUBLICANS

- Cotton - Dead set against use of Trust Fund for such purposes. Completion of Interstate System is just as important from safety point of view. In favor of a safety program, but should come out of general fund. Upset by prospect that safety bill will go to Public Works rather than Commerce.
- Morton - Generally favorable. 2/17
- Scott - Generally favorable; no special thoughts on financing. Agrees on need to require manufacturers to do something, but warns about giving manufacturers a chance to "sock the consumer" by passing along inflated costs. 2/28
- Prouty - Non-committal 2/28. attributed to safety requirement
- Pearson - Logic dictates financing from Highway Trust Fund, okay. 2/28
- Dominick - Reserves judgment. 3/1/66.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

DEMOCRATS

- Staggers - Expressed the conviction that the Commerce Committee should have jurisdiction over some of the features in the highway safety program. Mr. Staggers is very upset at prospect of safety bill going to Public Works. Has appealed to us to "do something." We suggested that jurisdiction and referral were matter for the House leadership (Carl Albert) and that, as of now, the President intended to finance the safety program from the Trust Fund.
- Rogers - Texas. Non-committal. 2/17
- Friedel - Okay
- Macdonald - Persistent efforts have failed to bring a response. 3-1-66
- Jarman - In hospital. 3/1
- O'Brien - Okay. 3/1
- Moss - Expressed no view. Questions why program will go to Public Works
- Dingell - "Not disposed to fight the plan on safety." He predicts jurisdictional problems between Ways and Means versus Public Works rather than Public Works versus Commerce. "Auto dealers will fuss." Will go along with the program "If you don't kick auto makers too hard. I don't bow to the Trust Fund like some others." He therefore has no objection on grounds of Trust Fund problems.
- Rogers - (Florida) Favors a strong highway safety program.
- Kornegay - Concerned about any delay in construction of interstate highways as result of taking money from the Trust Fund.
- Van Deerlin - For it all the way; okay. 3/1
- Pickle - No strong feeling except "It's time to do something."
- Rooney - Favors the program.
- Murphy - Generally in favor; should have recommendations to States to eliminate the "chronic nuts" who cause most of the accidents, with penalties for failure to act.
- Satterfield - Concerned about who makes decisions and who is calling the shots in the Federal aid to State program.
- Ronan - Sounds okay.
- Huot - Bill will have good reception; only concern is price tag; okay. 3/1
- Mackay - Okay. 3-1-66
- Gilligan - Generally favors. Makes sense to have uniform standards to replace confusion caused by standards of 50 States.

Highway Safety

House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, (continued)

DEMOCRATS (continued)

Farnsley - Okay 2/17

Williams - Just returned from Mississippi. Has not yet returned call for inquiry. 3:45 pm 3/1

REPUBLICANS

Springer - Feels that amount of money involved is high; predicts that Commerce Committee would limit it to a three-year authorization. 2/28

Younger - Generally favorable to a program but opposed to use of Trust Fund without additional revenues. Generally opposed to increased spending in view of Viet Nam; disagrees that nation can afford both Viet Nam and

Devine - Author of Ohio's auto inspection law; new programs. 2/25
probably okay. 2/28

Nelson - Non-committal. concerned about too many grant programs; thinks auto industry doing good job now. 2/28

Keith - Very non-committal. 2/28

Curtin - Sympathetic but concerned about costs in view of Viet Nam. 2/28

Cunningham - Traffic and safety engineer, mayor of Omaha. Strongly in favor of Safety - has own ideas. Concerned about restrictions on autos. prob. ok 2/2

Broyhill - (North Carolina) Wait and see. 3/1

Harvey - Doesn't sound bad. Will have to have some kind of auto standards. 3/1

Carter - Seems all right. Certainly more safety. In favor of all or large part of i
Probable okay. 3/1.

Watson - Traveling enroute. 3/1

TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE

Leadership

House:

Speaker McCormack - New Department - Brought up no particular problems relation to the new Department.

Safety - Use of Trust Fund for financing will cause difficulties. He said he had no opinion yet on where the bill would be referred, but did say that primary purpose of the bill, rather than method of financing, would probably be the controlling factor. This would mean House Interstate.

ICC - no problem.

Rep. Albert - New Department - Okay

ICC - Okay.

Safety - Okay, but believes that bill will be referred to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee rather than Public Works Committee even if financing is through the Trust Fund.

Hale Boggs - New Department - is concerned about possible effects on inland barges, trucking and maritime. Wants to look at the plan very carefully before making a commitment.

Highway safety - Strongly in favor of action, but has reservations about tapping the Trust Fund without further revenue being added.

ICC - Okay.

John Moss - Generally favorable to package.

Wilbur Mills - New Department - has no problem.

ICC - Okay.

Highway safety - concerned about additional expense to Highway Trust Fund, without additional revenues. States that pending proposal for increased user taxes on truckers will not receive Committee approval. Suggested possibility of reimposition of excise tax on automobile replacement parts. He is against stretch-out in time for completion of Interstate System.

Rep. Mahon - Concerned about new legislative proposals in view of present Vietnam situation and the great deal of legislation passed last year. He makes it clear that there are many scars left from highway beauty fight last year. Suggests "a little bit of non-change," instead of so many new proposals. He believes Congress, and the public, is in no mood for additional legislative programs.

ICC - no problem.

Safety - concern over additional expenditures even from the Trust Fund. Said he will discuss with Wilbur Mills, George Fallon and possibly Harley Staggers.

Rep. Frank Thompson - Okay on entire Transportation package, including highway safety financing.

Senate:

Mansfield - He believes all three proposals make sense and will push for their approval.

Russell Long - Okay on new Department if there is protection from railroads for inland waterways and no change in FAA patent policy. I assured him on both points.

He also expressed opposition to a delay in highway construction and urged repeal of the Byrd "pay-as-you-go" provision on the Highway Trust Fund. This would enable States to go ahead on road construction with reimbursement later. Under those circumstances, he would go along with payment of highway safety from the Trust Fund.

ICC - Okay.

Smathers - Department - in favor of new Department if it does not mean extra spending. Introduced a bill himself for new Department some years ago, and he'll fight for it. He said President should confine his efforts to the new Department, however, and not request new spending for a safety program. Predicted use of Trust Fund would be troublesome. He said he does not feel there is need enough for such spending under the circumstances of Vietnam and inflationary problems. He expressed great concern about spending and additional taxes.

ICC - Okay.

Sen. Pastore - Believes that transportation functions should be grouped within the Department of Commerce rather than in a new Department. He sees transportation as a "means to an end," namely, the support of our economy rather than an end in itself, and on this basis it would be more logical to have transportation functions under leadership of the Secretary of Commerce.

ICC - no problem.

Safety - no commitment.

Sen. Muskie - New Department - favorable, but warns that Senators will be concerned about role of certain existing agencies, such as FAA, after transfer to the new Department.

ICC - Okay.

Safety - concerned about charging costs to Highway Trust Fund. Also concerned about jurisdictional questions and said he would discuss with Mansfield.

Sen. Clinton Anderson - Against new Department. Transportation should be handled in Commerce Department.

Safety - favors a program, but not financing from Highway Trust Fund.

ICC - Okay.



THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

March 1, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: The Secretary of Commerce

Attached is a report on Congressional contacts made in connection with your forthcoming Message on Transportation, involving specifically:

1. The proposed new Department of Transportation Bill.
2. The Highway Safety Bill.
3. The Reorganization Plan for Presidential Appointment of the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The four principal committees are expected to be:

1. House and Senate Government Operations for the Department of Transportation Bill and ICC Reorganization Plan.
2. House and Senate Commerce Committees on Highway Safety Bill (assuming references to the substantive committees).

The views of members of other Committees are also important in many instances, and we have contacted a wide variety of them. Note particularly Senator Monroney's apparent opposition to the new Department because of his concern over the role of the Federal Aviation Agency, and Senator McNamara's opposition for several reasons including the role of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Also attached are comments I received from selected House and Senate leaders.

2.

In all cases, the comments are based on verbal explanations of the legislation to be proposed. We have tried to explore all potentially controversial features, but the comments reported here are obviously subject to change when the Members see the actual bills.

John T. Cannon

Attachments

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

February 28, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. CALIFANO
The White House

Subject: Proposed scenario for the Department of
Transportation briefings

I propose the following responsibilities for the legislative, press and industry briefings:

Secretary Connor - general kick-off, including a brief description of principal items in the Message.

Under Secretary Boyd - transportation policy and highway safety bill.

C. L. Schultze - organizational matters, including the strong chairman for the ICC.

For the nine o'clock meeting on Wednesday morning for second echelon Government personnel, you should provide the kick-off and I will provide the organizational material. It is my understanding that this meeting is to be limited to the Department of Transportation.

Attached is a brief summary of issues related to the Department of Transportation. We are producing a new second page, which will be available early tomorrow morning.

Attachment

✓ 6:00 ←
9:00 a.m. }
10:00 - Press
12:00 ←

SP2-3/1966/1TN
LE/SA 2
SA 2
FG155
FG11-1

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Two centuries ago the American nation came into being. Thirteen sparsely populated colonies, strung out along the Atlantic seaboard for 1300 miles, joined their separate wills in a common endeavor.

Three bonds united them.

There was the cultural bond of a single language.

There was the moral bond of a thirst for liberty and democratic government.

There was the physical bond of a few roads and rivers, by which the citizens of the colonies engaged in peaceful commerce.

Two centuries later the language is the same. The thirst for liberty and democracy endures.

The physical bond -- that tenuous skein of rough trails and primitive roads -- has become a powerful network on which the prosperity and convenience of our society depend.

In a nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union.

The Growth of our Transportation System

It is not necessary to look back to the 1760's to chronicle the astonishing growth of American transportation.

Twenty years ago there were 31 million motor vehicles in the United States. Today there are 90 million. By 1975 there will be nearly 120 million.

Twenty years ago there were 1.5 million miles of paved roads and streets in the United States. Today this figure has almost doubled.

Twenty years ago there were 38,000 private and commercial aircraft. Today there are more than 97,000.

Twenty years ago commercial airlines flew 209 million miles. Last year they flew one billion miles.

To Congress 3/2/66

RECEIVED
100 MAR 2 1966
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Twenty-five years ago American transportation moved 619 billion ton miles of cargo. In 1964, 1.5 trillion ton miles were moved.

The manufacturing of transportation equipment has kept pace. It has tripled since 1947. Last year \$4.5 billion was spent for new transportation plant and equipment.

Transportation is one of America's largest employers. There are:

- 737,000 railroad employees,
- 270,000 local and inter-urban workers,
- 230,000 in air transport,
- almost a million men and women in motor transport and storage.

Together with pipeline and water transportation employees, the total number of men and women who earn their livelihoods by moving people and goods is well over two and one-half million.

The Federal Government supports or regulates almost every means of transportation. Last year alone, more than \$5 billion in Federal funds were invested in transportation -- in highway construction, in river and harbor development, in airway operation and airport construction, in maritime subsidies. The government owns 1500 of the nation's 2500 ocean-going cargo vessels.

Our transportation system -- the descendant of the horse-drawn coaches and sailing ships of colonial times -- accounts for one in every six dollars in the American economy. In 1965, that amounted to \$120 billion -- a sum greater than the gross national product of this Nation in 1940.

Shortcomings of Our System

Vital as it is, mammoth and complex as it has become, the American transportation system is not good enough.

It is not good enough when it offers nearly a mile of street or road for every square mile of land -- and yet provides no relief from time-consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion.

It is not good enough when it produces sleek and efficient jet aircraft -- and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

It is not good enough when it builds super-highways for super-charged automobiles -- and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 highway deaths this year.

It is not good enough when public and private investors pour \$15 million into a large, high-speed ship -- only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded.

It is not good enough when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs -- and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

It is not good enough when it adheres to custom for its own sake -- and ignores opportunities to serve our people more economically and efficiently.

It is not good enough if it responds to the needs of an earlier America -- and does not help us expand our trade and distribute the fruits of our land throughout the world.

Why We Have Fallen Short

Our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted. It could not have done so, for it grew along with the country itself -- now restlessly expanding, now consolidating, as opportunity grew bright or dim.

Thus investment and service innovations responded to special needs. Research and development were sporadic, sometimes inconsistent, and largely oriented towards the promotion of a particular means of transportation.

As a result, America today lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travellers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is, despite the inconvenience and expense of:

- aging and often obsolete transportation plant and equipment.
- networks chiefly designed to serve a rural society.
- services long outstripped by our growing economy and population, by changes in land use, by new concepts in industrial plant location, warehousing and distribution.
- the failure to take full advantage of new technologies developed elsewhere in the economy.
- programs and policies which impede private initiative and dull incentives for innovation.

The result is waste -- of human and economic resources -- and of the taxpayers' dollar.

We have abided this waste too long.

We must not permit it to continue.

We have too much at stake in the quality and economy of our transportation system. If the growth of our transport industries merely keeps pace with our current national economic growth, the demand for transportation will more than double in the next twenty years.

But even that is too conservative an estimate. Passenger transportation is growing much faster than our Gross National Product -- reflecting the desires of an affluent people with ever-increasing incomes.

Private and Public Responsibility

The United States is the only major nation in the world that relies primarily upon privately owned and operated transportation.

That national policy has served us well. It must be continued.

But private ownership has been made feasible only by the use of publicly granted authority and the investment of public resources --

-- by the construction of locks, dams, and channels on our rivers and inland waterways.

-- by the development of a vast highway network.

-- by the construction and operation of airports and airways.

-- by the development of ports and harbors.

-- by direct financial support to the Merchant Marine.

-- by grants of eminent domain authority.

-- by capital equipment grants and demonstration projects for mass transit.

-- in years past, by grants of public land to assist the railroads.

Enlightened government has served as a full partner with private enterprise in meeting America's urgent need for mobility.

That partnership must now be strengthened with all the means that creative federalism can provide. The costs of a transportation paralysis in the years ahead are too severe. The rewards of an efficient system are too great. We cannot afford the luxury of drift -- or proceed with "business as usual."

We must secure for all our travellers and shippers the full advantages of modern science and technology.

We must acquire the reliable information we need for intelligent decisions.

We must clear away the institutional and political barriers which impede adaptation and change.

We must promote the efforts of private industry to give the American consumer more and better service for his transportation dollar.

We must coordinate the executive functions of our transportation agencies in a single coherent instrument of government. Thus policy guidance and support for each means of transportation will strengthen the national economy as a whole.

A Department of Transportation

I urge the Congress to establish a Cabinet level Department of Transportation.

I recommend that this Department bring together almost 100,000 employees and almost \$6 billion of Federal funds now devoted to transportation.

I urge the creation of such a Department to serve the growing demands of this great Nation, to satisfy the needs of our expanding industry and to fulfill the right of our taxpayers to maximum efficiency and frugality in Government operations.

In so doing, I follow the recommendations of many outstanding Americans.

In 1936, a Select Committee of the United States Senate recommended a Department of Transportation, or, in the alternative, the consolidation of all transportation programs in the Department of Commerce.

In 1949, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Transportation recommended a Department of Transportation.

In 1961 President Eisenhower recommended such a Department in his Budget Message.

In 1961 a Special Study Group of the Senate Committee on Commerce recommended that all promotional and safety programs of the Federal Government be concentrated in a Department of Transportation.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have offered bills to create the Department. Private citizens, the nation's leading experts in the field, have made the same recommendation to me.

It is time to act on these recommendations.

Scope of the Department

I propose that the following agencies and functions be consolidated in the Department of Transportation:

1. The Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and its Policy, Program, Emergency Transportation and Research staffs.
2. The Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal-aid Highway Program it administers.
3. The Federal Aviation Agency. This key agency, with its functions in aviation safety, promotion and investment, will be transferred in its entirety to the new Department. It will continue to carry out these functions in the new department.
4. The Coast Guard, whose principal peacetime activities relate to transportation and marine safety. The Coast Guard will be transferred as a unit from the Treasury Department. As in the past, the Coast Guard will operate as part of the Navy in time of war.
5. The Maritime Administration, with its construction and operating subsidy programs.
6. The safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of aircraft accidents and its appellate functions related to safety.
7. The safety functions and car service functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, principally the inspection and enforcement of safety regulations for railroads, motor carriers, and pipelines, and the distribution of rail car supply in times of shortage.
8. The Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Alaska Railroad, and certain minor transportation-related activities of other agencies.

As this list indicates, I am recommending the consolidation into the Department of those Federal agencies whose primary functions are transportation promotion and safety.

National Transportation Safety Board

No function of the new Department -- no responsibility of its Secretary -- will be more important than safety. We must insure the safety of our citizens as they travel on our land, in our skies, and over our waters.

I recommend that there be created under the Secretary of Transportation a National Transportation Safety Board independent of the operating units of the Department.

The sole function of this Board will be the safety of our travellers. It will review investigations of accidents to seek their causes. It will determine compliance with safety standards. It will examine the adequacy of the safety standards themselves. It will assume safety functions transferred from the ICC and the CAB.

I consider the functions of this Board so important that I am requesting authority from the Congress to name five Presidential appointees as its members.

Relation to Other Government Activities

The activities of several departments and agencies affect transportation promotion and safety. Sound management requires that an appropriate and intimate relationship be established between those activities and the new Department of Transportation.

1. The subsidy functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Aviation subsidies -- now provided only for local airline service -- clearly promote our domestic transportation system. But subsidy awards are an integral part of the process of authorizing air carrier service. This is a regulatory function.

Therefore the airline subsidy program should remain in the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Secretary of Transportation, however, will develop principles and criteria which the Board will take into consideration in its proceedings. In this way the subsidy program will be

coordinated with overall national transportation policy.

2. The navigation program of the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers -- through its construction of locks and harbor facilities and its channel deepening and river bank protection work -- makes a major contribution to water transportation. The Department of Transportation should not assume the responsibility for that construction, but its Secretary should be involved in the planning of water transportation projects.

With the approval of the President, the Secretary of Transportation should also issue standards and criteria for the economic evaluation of Federal transportation investments generally. In the case of transportation features of multi-purpose water projects, he should do so after consulting with the Water Resources Council.

3. International Aviation.

The Secretary of Transportation should provide leadership within the Executive Branch in formulating long-range policy for international aviation. While foreign policy aspects of international aviation are the responsibility of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation should insure that our international aviation policies are consistent with overall national transportation policy.

Subject to policy determinations by the President, the Civil Aeronautics Board regulates international aviation routes and fares as they affect the United States. This function has far-reaching effects on our foreign policy, our balance of payments, and the vitality of American aviation. The Secretary of Transportation should participate in Civil Aeronautics Board proceedings that involve international aviation policy.

4. Urban Transportation.

The Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation.

The future of urban transportation -- the safety, convenience, and indeed the livelihood of its users -- depends upon wide-scale, rational planning. If the Federal Government is to contribute to that planning, it must speak with a coherent voice.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development bears the principal responsibility for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. Yet it cannot perform this task without the counsel, support, and cooperation of the Department of Transportation.

I shall ask the two Secretaries to recommend to me, within a year after the creation of the new department, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved -- not only in principle, but in practical effect.

Role of the Department

The Department of Transportation will:

- coordinate the principal existing programs that promote transportation in America.
- bring new technology to a total transportation system, by promoting research and development in cooperation with private industry.
- improve safety in every means of transportation.
- encourage private enterprise to take full and prompt advantage of new technological opportunities.
- encourage high quality, low cost service to the public.
- conduct systems analyses and planning, to strengthen the weakest parts of today's system.
- develop investment criteria and standards, and analytical techniques to assist all levels of government and industry in their transportation investments.

The Interstate Commerce Commission

The Cabinet level Department I recommend will not alter the economic regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Federal Maritime Commission.

I do recommend, however, a change in the manner of selecting the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Today, the Chairman of this vital commission -- alone among the Federal regulatory agencies -- is selected, not by the President, but by annual rotation among the eleven commissioners.

This is not sound management practice in an agency whose influence on our rail, highway, waterway and pipeline industries is so far-reaching.

The ICC bears the demanding and challenging responsibility to keep federal regulation attuned to the needs and opportunities of a dynamic industry. Its jurisdiction extends to 18,000 transport companies. It handles 7,000 cases each year. No private corporation of such size and importance would change its chief executive officer once each year.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to give the President authority to designate the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission from among its members, and to strengthen his executive functions.

Safety

105,000 Americans died in accidents last year.

More than half were killed in transportation, or in recreation accidents related to transportation.

49,000 deaths involved motor vehicles.

1,300 involved aircraft.

1,500 involved ships and boats.

2,300 involved railroads.

Millions of Americans were injured in transportation accidents -- the overwhelming majority involving automobiles.

Each means of transportation has developed safety programs of varying effectiveness. Yet we lack a comprehensive program keyed to a total transportation system.

Proven safety techniques in one means have not always been adapted in others.

Last year the highway death toll set a new record. The prediction for this year is that more than 50,000 persons will die on our streets and highways -- more than 50,000 useful and promising lives will be lost, and as many families stung by grief.

The toll of Americans killed in this way since the introduction of the automobile is truly unbelievable. It is 1.5 million -- more than all the combat deaths suffered in all our wars.

No other necessity of modern life has brought more convenience to the American people -- or more tragedy -- than the automobile.

Why We Are Failing

The carnage on the highways must be arrested.

As I said some weeks ago, we must replace suicide with sanity and anarchy with safety.

The weaknesses of our present highway safety program must be corrected:

- Our knowledge of causes is grossly inadequate. Expert opinion is frequently contradictory and confusing.
- Existing safety programs are widely dispersed. Government and private efforts proceed separately, without effective coordination.

- There is no clear assignment of responsibility of the Federal level.
- The allocation of our resources to highway safety is inadequate.
- Neither private industry nor government officials concerned with automotive transportation have made safety first among their priorities. Yet we know that expensive freeways, powerful engines, and smooth exteriors will not stop the massacre on our roads.

What Can Be Done

State and local resources are insufficient to bring about swift reductions in the highway death rate. The Federal government must provide additional resources. Existing programs must be expanded. Pioneer work must begin in neglected areas.

Federal highway safety responsibilities should be incorporated into the Department of Transportation, in a total transportation safety program.

I have already set in motion a number of steps under existing law:

1. To strengthen the Federal role, I am assigning responsibility for coordinating Federal highway safety programs to the Secretary of Commerce. I am directing the Secretary to establish a major highway safety unit within his Department. This unit will ultimately be transferred to the Department of Transportation. The President's Committee on Traffic Safety will be reorganized, strengthened and supported entirely by federal funds. The Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board will be reconstituted and the Secretary's role strengthened.

2. To give greater support to our safety programs, I am requesting increased funds for research, accident data collection, improved emergency medical service, driver education and testing and traffic control technology.

I have also asked the Secretary of Commerce to evaluate systematically the resources allocated to traffic safety, to insure that we are receiving the maximum benefits from our present efforts.

3. To improve driving conditions, I have ordered that high priority be given to our efforts to build safety features into the Federal-aid highway network.

4. To save those who are injured, I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, immediately to initiate projects to demonstrate techniques for more effective emergency care and transportation. He will work in full cooperation with state, local and private officials.

5. To help us better understand the causes of highway accidents, I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to establish accident investigation teams, who will bring us new understanding of highway accidents and their causes.

6. To make government vehicles safer, I have asked the Administrator of General Services, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, to begin a detailed study of the additional vehicle safety features that should be added to the Federal fleet.

The Traffic Safety Act of 1966

More -- much more -- remains to be done. The people of America deserve an aggressive highway safety program.

I believe that the Congress -- the same Congress which last year gave the Secretary of Commerce broad authority to set uniform standards for State highway safety programs -- will join in our efforts to bring that program into being.

I urge the Congress to enact the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

I urge greater support for state highway safety programs.

I urge the creation of a National Highway Research and Test Facility.

To begin, I recommend a \$700 million, six year program.

The three components of this program are as critically important as the problems they address.

First, federal grants to the States for highway safety will be increased.

With these funds, a comprehensive highway safety program can be developed by each State under standards approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Included will be measures such as driver education and licensing -- advanced traffic control techniques -- regular vehicle safety inspections -- police and emergency medical services.

Second, automobile safety performance will be improved. Proper design and engineering can make our cars safer. Vehicles sold in interstate commerce must be designed and equipped for maximum safety. Safe performance design standards must be met in tomorrow's cars.

I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to determine the necessary safety performance criteria for all vehicles and their components.

If, after a two year period, the Secretary finds that adequate voluntary standards are not satisfactory, he would be authorized to prescribe nation-wide mandatory safety standards. He would be also authorized to prohibit the sale in interstate commerce of new vehicles and their components which failed to meet those standards.

Third, the Federal government's highway safety research efforts will be expanded.

I recommend construction of a national highway safety research and test center.

Funds are needed to support research and testing in many disciplines related to highway safety. The public interest demands a better understanding of the human, highway and vehicle factors which cause death and injury. We must develop more effective counter-measures and objective standards to guide our national programs. Special accident teams should be organized -- accurate data collection should be enlarged on a national basis -- fellowship grants and research support should be made available to attract the best minds and talents of our Nation to this urgent work.

This new highway safety program would be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation upon the creation of the new Department.

Congress has not hesitated to establish rigorous safety standards for other means of transportation when circumstances demanded them.

Today's highway death toll calls for an equally vigorous and effective expression of concern for our millions of car-owning families. For unless we avert this slaughter, one out of every two Americans will one day be killed or seriously injured on our highways.

Safety Standards for Motor Vehicle Tires

I urge the Congress to act speedily and favorably on S. 2669, a bill establishing safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce.

Most tires sold to American drivers are produced and properly tested by reputable companies. Nevertheless, evidence has shown that increasing numbers of inferior tires are being sold to unwitting customers throughout the country. The dangers such tires hold for high-speed automobiles and their occupants is obvious.

S. 2669 provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall establish, and publish in the Federal Register, interim minimum safety standards for tires. The Secretary would be required to review these standards two years from the enactment of the bill, and to revise them where necessary. A research and development program under his direction would improve the minimum standards for new tires, and develop such standards for retreaded tires.

Our driving public deserves the prompt passage of S. 2669, and the protection it will afford them from accidents caused by tire failures.

Safety at Sea

Last year 90 men and women lost their lives when the cruise ship Yarmouth Castle burned and sank in the calm waters of the Caribbean.

The Yarmouth Castle was exempt from United States safety standards -- partially because of its "grandfather rights" under law. It was built before 1937.

We cannot allow the lives of our citizens to depend upon the year in which a ship was built.

The Coast Guard is presently completing its investigation of the Yarmouth Castle disaster. The Maritime Administration has already finished its investigation of financial responsibility.

Later in this session -- when our inquiries are accomplished and our findings reported -- we will submit to the Congress legislation to improve safety measures and guarantees of financial responsibility on the part of owners and operators of passenger-carrying vessels sailing from our ports.

Air Accident Compensation

The United States has declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Convention. Under this pact, the financial liability of a member nation's airline is limited to \$8300 for a passenger's death.

Discussions are underway in the International Civil Aviation Organization to increase this liability for passengers flying anywhere in the world. We have expressed our opinion that the limit of liability should be raised to \$100,000.

Research and Development

Today the United States ranks as the world's leader in technology.

Despite this -- and despite the importance of transportation in the competition for international trade -- exclusive of national security and space, the Federal government spends less than one percent of its total research and development budget for transportation.

Under our system of government, private enterprise bears the primary responsibility for research and development in the transportation field.

But the government can help. It can plan and fashion research and development for a total transportation system which is beyond the responsibility or capability of private industry.

Through government-sponsored research and development we can --

- Fully understand the complex relationships among the components of a total transportation system.
- Provide comprehensive and reliable data for both private and public decisions.
- Identify areas of transportation which can be exploited by private industry to provide safer and more efficient services to the public.
- Build the basis for a more efficient use of public resources.
- Provide the technological base needed to assure adequate domestic and international transportation in times of emergency.
- Help make significant advances in every phase of transport -- in aircraft, in ocean-going ships, in swifter rail service, in safer vehicles.

Supersonic Transport Aircraft

The United States is pre-eminent in the field of aircraft design and manufacture.

We intend to maintain that leadership.

As I said in my State of the Union Message, I am proposing a program to construct and flight test a new 2000-mile-per-hour supersonic aircraft.

Our supersonic transport must be reliable and safe for the passenger.

It must be profitable for both the airlines and the manufacturers.

Its operating performance must be superior to any comparable aircraft.

It must be introduced into the market in a timely manner.

We have underway an intensive research and design program on the supersonic transport, supported by appropriations of \$231 million.

The design competition for this aircraft and its engines is intense and resourceful.

I am requesting \$200 million in Fiscal Year 1967 appropriations to initiate the prototype phase of the supersonic transport. My request includes funds for the completion of design competition, expanded economic and sonic boom studies, and the start of prototype construction.

We hope to conduct first flight tests of the supersonic transport by 1970, and to introduce it into commercial service by 1974.

Aircraft Noise

The jet age has brought progress and prosperity to our air transportation system. Modern jets can carry passengers and freight across a continent at speeds close to that of sound.

Yet this progress has created special problems of its own.

Aircraft noise is a growing source of annoyance and concern to the thousands of citizens who live near many of our large airports. As more of our airports begin to accommodate jets and as the volume of air travel expands, the problem will take on added dimension.

There are no simple or swift solutions. But it is clear that we must embark now on a concerted effort to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise. To this end, I am today directing the President's Science Advisor to work with the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretaries of Commerce, and of Housing and Urban Development, to frame an action program to attack this problem.

I am asking this group to:

- study the development of noise standards and the compatible uses of land near airports,
- consult with local communities and industry,
- recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in this area.

Advanced Ocean Vessel Concepts

After years of United States leadership, maritime technology in other countries has caught up with and, in some instances, surpassed our own.

The U. S. Merchant Marine suffers in world competition because it bears much higher costs than its competitors. This can be offset in some measure by technological improvements.

The Department of Defense recently launched the Fast Deployment Logistics Ship program. This concept introduces to the maritime field the same systems approach that has proven so successful in other Defense and Aerospace programs.

To achieve comparable improvements throughout the maritime industry, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce, with the Secretary of Defense, the President's Scientific Advisor, and the Atomic Energy Commission, to conduct a study of advanced vessel concepts.

The work of this team will include:

- Research, development and planning of high speed, large capacity ships, devoted primarily to transporting pre-loaded containers of varying types between the major ports in the world.
- Research on an ocean-going Surface Effects Vessel capable of skimming over the water at speeds more than 100 knots.
- Continued exploration of the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant marine ships.

Our private shipyards should continue to serve the needs of the Country. They can become more productive and competitive through research and development and through standardization of ship construction. With a new Department of Transportation, we will increase our efforts to bring a modern, efficient merchant marine fleet to this Nation.

Advanced Land Transport

Last year Congress took a long step towards advanced land transportation by enacting the High-Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development program. This program will be continued at the most rapid pace consistent with sound management of the research effort.

Similar vision and imagination can be applied to highway transport.

Segments of the Interstate Highway network already in operation are the most efficient, productive roads ever built anywhere in the world. Motor vehicles move at higher rates of speed, more safely and in greater number per lane than on conventional roads. Transportation costs are reduced, and less land area is needed for this volume of traffic.

With the network about half completed after 10 years, it is apparent that Interstate Highways, as well as other roads and streets, can become even more productive and safe.

Accordingly, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce to:

- Investigate means for providing guidance and control mechanisms to increase the capacity and improve the safety of our highway network.
- Conduct research into the means of improving traffic flow -- particularly in our cities -- so we can make better use of our existing roads and streets.
- Investigate the potential of separate roadways for various classes of vehicles, with emphasis on improving mass transportation service.

Systems Research

Some of our brightest opportunities in research and development lie in the less obvious and often neglected parts of our transportation system.

We spend billions for constructing new highways, but comparatively little for traffic control devices.

We spend millions for fast jet aircraft -- but little on the traveler's problem of getting to and from the airport.

We have mounted a sizable government-industry program to expand exports, yet we allow a mountain of red tape paperwork negate our efforts. Worldwide, a total of 810 forms are required to cover all types of cargo imported and exported. In this country alone, as many as 43 separate forms are used in one export shipment. Eighty separate forms may be needed to process some imports. This is paperwork run wild.

I am directing the Secretaries of Treasury and Commerce and the Attorney General to attack these problems, through the use of effective systems research programs. And I have directed them to eliminate immediately every unnecessary element of red tape that inhibits our import and export programs.

Transportation for America

The Founding Fathers rode by stage to Philadelphia to take part in the Constitutional Convention. They could not have anticipated the immense complexity -- or the problems -- of transportation in our day.

Yet they, too, recognized the vital national interest in commerce between the States. The early Congresses expressed that interest even more directly, by supporting the development of road and waterway systems.

Most important, The Founding Fathers gave us a flexible system of Government. Cities, states and the federal government can join together -- and in many cases work with private enterprise -- in partnerships of creative Federalism to solve our most complex problems.

For the very size of our transportation requirements -- rising step-by-step with the growth of our population and industry -- demands that we respond with new institutions, new programs of research, new efforts to make our vehicles safe, as well as swift.

Modern transportation can be the rapid conduit of economic growth -- or a bottleneck.

It can bring jobs and loved ones and recreation closer to every family -- or it can bring instead sudden and purposeless death.

It can improve every man's standard of living -- or multiply the cost of all he buys.

It can be a convenience, a pleasure, the passport to new horizons of the mind and spirit -- or it can frustrate and impede and delay.

The choice is ours to make.

We build the cars, the trains, the planes, the ships, the roads and the airports. We can, if we will, plan their safe and efficient use in the decades ahead to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

The program I have outlined in this message is the first step toward that goal.

I urge its prompt enactment by the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE,

March 2, 1966.

FOR RELEASE AT 12 NOON (EST), MARCH 2, 1966

NOTICE: There should be no premature release of this Message to the Congress, nor should its contents be paraphrased, alluded to or hinted at in earlier stories. There is a total embargo on this message until 12:00 noon March 2, 1966, which includes any and all references to any material in this message.

Bill Moyers

THE WHITE HOUSE

MESSAGE ON TRANSPORTATION

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

Two centuries ago the American nation came into being. Thirteen sparsely populated colonies, strung out along the Atlantic seaboard for 1300 miles, joined their separate wills in a common endeavor.

Three bonds united them.

There was the cultural bond of a single language.

There was the moral bond of a thirst for liberty and democratic government.

There was the physical bond of a few roads and rivers, by which the citizens of the colonies engaged in peaceful commerce.

Two centuries later the language is the same. The thirst for liberty and democracy endures.

The physical bond -- that tenuous skein of rough-trails and primitive roads -- has become a powerful network on which the prosperity and convenience of our society depend.

In a nation that spans a continent, transportation is the web of union.

The Growth of our Transportation System

It is not necessary to look back to the 1760's to chronicle the astonishing growth of American transportation.

Twenty years ago there were 31 million motor vehicles in the United States. Today there are 90 million. By 1975 there will be nearly 120 million.

Twenty years ago there were 1.5 million miles of paved roads and streets in the United States. Today this figure has almost doubled.

Twenty years ago there were 38,000 private and commercial aircraft. Today there are more than 97,000.

more

Twenty years ago commercial airlines flew 209 million miles. Last year they flew one billion miles.

Twenty-five years ago American transportation moved 619 billion ton miles of cargo. In 1964, 1.5 trillion ton miles were moved.

The manufacturing of transportation equipment has kept pace. It has tripled since 1947. Last year \$4.5 billion was spent for new transportation plant and equipment.

Transportation is one of America's largest employers. There are:

- 737,000 railroad employees,
- 270,000 local and inter-urban workers,
- 230,000 in air transport,
- almost a million men and women in motor transport and storage.

Together with pipeline and water transportation employees, the total number of men and women who earn their livelihoods by moving people and goods is well over two and one-half million.

The Federal Government supports or regulates almost every means of transportation. Last year alone more than \$5 billion in Federal funds were invested in transportation -- in highway construction, in river and harbor development, in airway operation and airport construction, in maritime subsidies. The government owns 1500 of the nation's 2500 ocean-going cargo vessels.

Our transportation system -- the descendant of the horse-drawn coaches and sailing ships of colonial times -- accounts for one in every six dollars in the American economy. In 1965, that amounted to \$120 billion -- a sum greater than the gross national product of this Nation in 1940.

Shortcomings of Our System

Vital as it is, mammoth and complex as it has become, the American transportation system is not good enough.

It is not good enough when it offers nearly a mile of street or road for every square mile of land -- and yet provides no relief from time-consuming, frustrating, and wasteful congestion.

It is not good enough when it produces sleek and efficient jet aircraft -- and yet cannot move passengers to and from airports in the time it takes those aircraft to fly hundreds of miles.

It is not good enough when it builds super-highways for super-charged automobiles -- and yet cannot find a way to prevent 50,000 highway deaths this year.

It is not good enough when public and private investors pour \$15 million into a large, high-speed ship -- only to watch it remain idle in port for days before it is loaded.

It is not good enough when it lays out new freeways to serve new cities and suburbs -- and carelessly scars the irreplaceable countryside.

more

It is not good enough when it adheres to custom for its own sake -- and ignores opportunities to serve our people more economically and efficiently.

It is not good enough if it respond to the needs of an earlier America -- and does not help us expand our trade and distribute the fruits of our land throughout the world.

Why We Have Fallen Short

Our transportation system has not emerged from a single drawing board, on which the needs and capacities of our economy were all charted. It could not have done so, for it grew along with the country itself -- now restlessly expanding, now consolidating, as opportunity grew bright or dim.

Thus investment and service innovations responded to special needs. Research and development were sporadic, sometimes inconsistent, and largely oriented towards the promotion of a particular means of transportation.

As a result, America today lacks a coordinated transportation system that permits travellers and goods to move conveniently and efficiently from one means of transportation to another, using the best characteristics of each.

Both people and goods are compelled to conform to the system as it is, despite the inconvenience and expense of:

- aging and often obsolete transportation plant and equipment.
- networks chiefly designed to serve a rural society.
- services long outstripped by our growing economy and population, by changes in land use, by new concepts in industrial plant location, warehousing and distribution.
- the failure to take full advantage of new technologies developed elsewhere in the economy.
- programs and policies which impede private initiative and dull incentives for innovation.

The result is waste -- of human and economic resources -- and of the taxpayers' dollar.

We have abided this waste too long.

We must not permit it to continue.

We have too much at stake in the quality and economy of our transportation system. If the growth of our transport industries merely keeps pace with our current national economic growth, the demand for transportation will more than double in the next twenty years.

But even that is too conservative an estimate. Passenger transportation is growing much faster than our Gross National Product -- reflecting the desires of an affluent people with ever-increasing incomes.

Private and Public Responsibility

The United States is the only major nation in the world that relies primarily upon privately owned and operated transportation.

That national policy has served us well. It must be continued.

But private ownership has been made feasible only by the use of publicly granted authority and the investment of public resources --

- by the construction of locks, dams, and channels on our rivers and inland waterways.
- by the development of a vast highway network.
- by the construction and operation of airports and airways.
- by the development of ports and harbors.
- by direct financial support to the Merchant Marine.
- by grants of eminent domain authority.
- by capital equipment grants and demonstration projects for mass transit.
- in years past, by grants of public land to assist the railroads.

Enlightened government has served as a full partner with private enterprise in meeting America's urgent need for mobility.

That partnership must now be strengthened with all the means that creative federalism can provide. The costs of a transportation paralysis in the years ahead are too severe. The rewards of an efficient system are too great. We cannot afford the luxury of drift -- or proceed with "business as usual."

We must secure for all our travellers and shippers the full advantages of modern science and technology.

We must acquire the reliable information we need for intelligent decisions.

We must clear away the institutional and political barriers which impede adaptation and change.

We must promote the efforts of private industry to give the American consumer more and better service for his transportation dollar.

We must coordinate the executive functions of our transportation agencies in a single coherent instrument of government. Thus policy guidance and support for each means of transportation will strengthen the national economy as a whole.

more

A Department of Transportation

I urge the Congress to establish a Cabinet level Department of Transportation.

I recommend that this Department bring together almost 100,000 employees and almost \$6 billion of Federal funds now devoted to transportation.

I urge the creation of such a Department to serve the growing demands of this great Nation, to satisfy the needs of our expanding industry and to fulfill the right of our taxpayers to maximum efficiency and frugality in Government operations.

In so doing, I follow the recommendations of many outstanding Americans.

In 1936, a Select Committee of the United States Senate recommended a Department of Transportation, or, in the alternative, the consolidation of all transportation programs in the Department of Commerce.

In 1949, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Transportation recommended a Department of Transportation.

In 1961 President Eisenhower recommended such a Department in his Budget Message.

In 1961 a Special Study Group of the Senate Committee on Commerce recommended that all promotional and safety programs of the Federal Government be concentrated in a Department of Transportation.

Many distinguished Members of Congress have offered bills to create the Department. Private citizens, the nation's leading experts in the field, have made the same recommendation to me.

It is time to act on these recommendations.

Scope of the Department

I propose that the following agencies and functions be consolidated in the Department of Transportation:

1. The Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and its Policy, Program, Emergency Transportation and Research staffs.

2. The Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal-aid Highway Program it administers.

3. The Federal Aviation Agency. This key agency, with its functions in aviation safety, promotion and investment, will be transferred in its entirety to the new Department. It will continue to carry out these functions in the new department.

4. The Coast Guard, whose principal peacetime activities relate to transportation and marine safety. The Coast Guard will be transferred as a unit from the Treasury Department. As in the past, the Coast Guard will operate as part of the Navy in time of war.

more

5. The Maritime Administration, with its construction and operating subsidy programs.

6. The safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of aircraft accidents and its appellate functions related to safety.

7. The safety functions and car service functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, principally the inspection and enforcement of safety regulations for railroads, motor carriers, and pipelines, and the distribution of rail car supply in times of shortage.

8. The Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Alaska Railroad, and certain minor transportation-related activities of other agencies.

As this list indicates, I am recommending the consolidation into the Department of those Federal agencies whose primary functions are transportation promotion and safety.

National Transportation Safety Board

No function of the new Department -- no responsibility of its Secretary-- will be more important than safety. We must insure the safety of our citizens as they travel on our land, in our skies, and over our waters.

I recommend that there be created under the Secretary of Transportation a National Safety Transportation Board independent of the operating units of the Department.

The sole function of this Board will be the safety of our travellers. It will review investigations of accidents to seek their causes. It will determine compliance with safety standards. It will examine the adequacy of the safety standards themselves. It will assume safety functions transferred from the ICC and the CAB.

I consider the functions of this Board so important that I am requesting authority from the Congress to name five Presidential appointees as its members.

Relation to Other Government Activities

The activities of several departments and agencies affect transportation promotion and safety. Sound management requires that an appropriate and intimate relationship be established between those activities and the new Department of Transportation.

1. The subsidy functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Aviation subsidies -- now provided only for local airline service -- clearly promote our domestic transportation system. But subsidy awards are an integral part of the process of authorizing air carrier service. This is a regulatory function.

more

Therefore the airline subsidy program should remain in the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Secretary of Transportation, however, will develop principles and criteria which the Board will take into consideration in its proceedings. In this way the subsidy program will be coordinated with overall national transportation policy.

2. The navigation program of the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers -- through its construction of locks and harbor facilities and its channel deepening and river bank protection work -- makes a major contribution to water transportation. The Department of Transportation should not assume the responsibility for that construction, but its Secretary should be involved in the planning of water transportation projects.

With the approval of the President, the Secretary of Transportation should also issue standards and criteria for the economic evaluation of Federal transportation investments generally. In the case of transportation features of multi-purpose water projects, he should do so after consulting with the Water Resources Council.

3. International Aviation.

The Secretary of Transportation should provide leadership within the Executive Branch in formulating long-range policy for international aviation. While foreign policy aspects of international aviation are the responsibility of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation should insure that our international aviation policies are consistent with overall national transportation policy.

Subject to policy determinations by the President, the Civil Aeronautics Board regulates international aviation routes and fares as they affect the United States. This function has far-reaching effects on our foreign policy, our balance of payments, and the vitality of American aviation. The Secretary of Transportation should participate in Civil Aeronautics Board proceedings that involve international aviation policy.

4. Urban Transportation.

The Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development must cooperate in decisions affecting urban transportation.

The future of urban transportation -- the safety, convenience, and indeed the livelihood of its users -- depends upon wide-scale, rational planning. If the Federal Government is to contribute to that planning, it must speak with a coherent voice.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development bears the principal responsibility for a unified Federal approach to urban problems. Yet it cannot perform this task without the counsel, support, and cooperation of the Department of Transportation.

I shall ask the two Secretaries to recommend to me, within a year after the creation of the new department, the means and procedures by which this cooperation can best be achieved -- not only in principle, but in practical effect.

more

Role of the Department

The Department of Transportation will:

- coordinate the principal existing programs that promote transportation in America.
- bring new technology to a total transportation system, by promoting research and development in cooperation with private industry.
- improve safety in every means of transportation.
- encourage private enterprise to take full and prompt advantage of new technological opportunities.
- encourage high quality, low cost service to the public.
- conduct systems analyses and planning, to strengthen the weakest parts of today's system.
- develop investment criteria and standards, and analytical techniques to assist all levels of government and industry in their transportation investments.

The Interstate Commerce Commission

The Cabinet level Department I recommend will not alter the economic regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Federal Maritime Commission.

I do recommend, however, a change in the manner of selecting the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Today, the Chairman of this vital commission -- alone among the Federal regulatory agencies -- is selected, not by the President, but by annual rotation among the eleven commissioners.

This is not sound management practice in an agency whose influence on our rail, highway, waterway and pipeline industries is so far-reaching.

The ICC bears the demanding and challenging responsibility to keep federal regulation attuned to the needs and opportunities of a dynamic industry. Its jurisdiction extends to 18,000 transport companies. It handles 7,000 cases each year. No private corporation of such size and importance would change its chief executive officer once each year.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to give the President authority to designate the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission from among its members, and to strengthen his executive functions.

Safety

105,000 Americans died in accidents last year.

more

More than half were killed in transportation, or in recreation accidents related to transportation.

49,000 deaths involved motor vehicles.

1,300 involved aircraft.

1,500 involved ships and boats.

2,300 involved railroads.

Millions of Americans were injured in transportation accidents -- the overwhelming majority involving automobiles.

Each means of transportation has developed safety programs of varying effectiveness. Yet we lack a comprehensive program keyed to a total transportation system.

Proven safety techniques in one means have not always been adapted in others.

Last year the highway death toll set a new record. The prediction for this year is that more than 50,000 persons will die on our streets and highways -- more than 50,000 useful and promising lives will be lost, and as many families stung by grief.

The toll of Americans killed in this way since the introduction of the automobile is truly unbelievable. It is 1.5 million -- more than all the combat deaths suffered in all our wars.

No other necessity of modern life has brought more convenience to the American people -- or more tragedy -- than the automobile.

Why We Are Failing

The carnage on the highways must be arrested.

As I said some weeks ago, we must replace suicide with sanity and anarchy with safety.

The weaknesses of our present highway safety program must be corrected:

- Our knowledge of causes is grossly inadequate. Expert opinion is frequently contradictory and confusing.
- Existing safety programs are widely dispersed. Government and private efforts proceed separately, without effective coordination.
- There is no clear assignment of responsibility at the Federal level.
- The allocation of our resources to highway safety is inadequate.

more

- Neither private industry nor government officials concerned with automotive transportation have made safety first among their priorities. Yet we know that expensive freeways, powerful engines, and smooth exteriors will not stop the massacre on our roads.

What Can Be Done

State and local resources are insufficient to bring about swift reductions in the highway death rate. The Federal government must provide additional resources. Existing programs must be expanded. Pioneer work must begin in neglected areas.

Federal highway safety responsibilities should be incorporated into the Department of Transportation, in a total transportation safety program.

I have already set in motion a number of steps under existing law:

1. To strengthen the Federal role, I am assigning responsibility for coordinating Federal highway safety programs to the Secretary of Commerce. I am directing the Secretary to establish a major highway safety unit within his Department. This unit will ultimately be transferred to the Department of Transportation. The President's Committee on Traffic Safety will be reorganized, strengthened and supported entirely by federal funds. The Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board will be reconstituted and the Secretary's role strengthened.

2. To give greater support to our safety programs, I am requesting increased funds for research, accident data collection, improved emergency medical service, driver education and testing and traffic control technology.

I have also asked the Secretary of Commerce to evaluate systematically the resources allocated to traffic safety, to insure that we are receiving the maximum benefits from our present efforts.

3. To improve driving conditions, I have ordered that high priority be given to our efforts to build safety features into the Federal-aid highway network.

4. To save those who are injured, I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, immediately to initiate projects to demonstrate techniques for more effective emergency care and transportation. He will work in full cooperation with state, local and private officials.

5. To help us better understand the causes of highway accidents, I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to establish accident investigation teams, who will bring us new understanding of highway accidents and their causes.

6. To make government vehicles safer, I have asked the Administrator of General Services, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, to begin a detailed study of the additional vehicle safety features that should be added to the Federal fleet.

more

The Traffic Safety Act of 1966

More -- much more -- remains to be done. The people of America deserve an aggressive highway safety program.

I believe that the Congress -- the same Congress which last year gave the Secretary of Commerce broad authority to set uniform standards for State highway safety programs -- will join in our efforts to bring that program into being.

I urge the Congress to enact the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

I urge greater support for state highway safety programs.

I urge the creation of a National Highway Research and Test Facility.

To begin, I recommend a \$700 million, six year program.

The three components of this program are as critically important as the problems they address.

First, federal grants to the States for highway safety will be increased. With these funds, a comprehensive highway safety program can be developed by each State under standards approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Included will be measures such as driver education and licensing -- advanced traffic control techniques -- regular vehicle safety inspections -- police and emergency medical services.

Second, automobile safety performance will be improved. Proper design and engineering can make our cars safer. Vehicles sold in interstate commerce must be designed and equipped for maximum safety. Safe performance design standards must be met in tomorrow's cars.

I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to determine the necessary safety performance criteria for all vehicles and their components.

If, after a two year period, the Secretary finds that adequate voluntary standards are not satisfactory, he would be authorized to prescribe nationwide mandatory safety standards. He would be also authorized to prohibit the sale in interstate commerce of new vehicles and their components which failed to meet those standards.

Third, the Federal government's highway safety research efforts will be expanded.

I recommend construction of a national highway safety research and test center.

Funds are needed to support research and testing in many disciplines related to highway safety. The public interest demands a better understanding of the human, highway and vehicle factors which cause death and injury. We must develop more effective counter-measures and objective standards to guide our national programs. Special accident teams should be organized -- accurate data collection should be enlarged on a national basis -- fellowship grants and research support should be made available to attract the best minds and talents of our Nation to this urgent work.

more

This new highway safety program would be transferred to the Secretary of Transportation upon the creation of the new Department.

Congress has not hesitated to establish rigorous safety standards for other means of transportation when circumstances demanded them.

Today's highway death toll calls for an equally vigorous and effective expression of concern for our millions of car-owning families. For unless we avert this slaughter, one out of every two Americans will one day be killed or seriously injured on our highways.

Safety Standards for Motor Vehicle Tires

I urge the Congress to act speedily and favorably on S. 2669, a bill establishing safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce.

Most tires sold to American drivers are produced and properly tested by reputable companies. Nevertheless, evidence has shown that increasing numbers of inferior tires are being sold to unwitting customers throughout the country. The dangers such tires hold for high-speed automobiles and their occupants is obvious.

S. 2669 provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall establish, and publish in the Federal Register, interim minimum safety standards for tires. The Secretary would be required to review these standards two years from the enactment of the bill, and to revise them where necessary. A research and development program under his direction would improve the minimum standards for new tires, and develop such standards for retreaded tires.

Our driving public deserves the prompt passage of S. 2669, and the protection it will afford them from accidents caused by tire failures.

Safety at Sea

Last year 90 men and women lost their lives when the cruise ship Yarmouth Castle burned and sank in the calm waters of the Caribbean.

The Yarmouth Castle was exempt from United States safety standards -- partially because of its "grandfather rights" under law. It was built before 1937.

We cannot allow the lives of our citizens to depend upon the year in which a ship was built.

The Coast Guard is presently completing its investigation of the Yarmouth Castle disaster. The Maritime Administration has already finished its investigation of financial responsibility.

Later in this session -- when our inquiries are accomplished and our findings reported -- we will submit to the Congress legislation to improve safety measures and guarantees of financial responsibility on the part of owners and operators of passenger-carrying vessels sailing from our ports.

Air Accident Compensation

The United States has declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Convention. Under this pact, the financial liability of a member nation's airline is limited to \$8300 for a passenger's death.

Discussions are underway in the International Civil Aviation Organization to increase this liability for passengers flying anywhere in the world. We have expressed our opinion that the limit of liability should be raised to \$100,000.

Research and Development

Today the United States ranks as the world's leader in technology.

Despite this -- and despite the importance of transportation in the competition for international trade -- exclusive of national security and space, the Federal government spends less than one percent of its total research and development budget for transportation.

Under our system of government, private enterprise bears the primary responsibility for research and development in the transportation field.

But the government can help. It can plan and fashion research and development for a total transportation system which is beyond the responsibility or capability of private industry.

Through government-sponsored research and development we can --

- Fully understand the complex relationships among the components of a total transportation system.
- Provide comprehensive and reliable data for both private and public decisions.
- Identify areas of transportation which can be exploited by private industry to provide safer and more efficient services to the public.
- Build the basis for a more efficient use of public resources.
- Provide the technological base needed to assure adequate domestic and international transportation in times of emergency.
- Help make significant advances in every phase of transport -- in aircraft, in ocean-going ships, in swifter rail service, in safer vehicles.

The Department of Transportation -- working with private industry and other government agencies -- will provide a coordinated program of research and development to move the Nation toward our transportation goals. The Department can help translate scientific discovery into industrial practice.

more

Supersonic Transport Aircraft

The United States is pre-eminent in the field of aircraft design and manufacture.

We intend to maintain that leadership.

As I said in my State of the Union Message, I am proposing a program to construct and flight test a new 2000-mile-per-hour supersonic aircraft.

Our supersonic transport must be reliable and safe for the passenger.

It must be profitable for both the airlines and the manufacturers.

Its operating performance must be superior to any comparable aircraft.

It must be introduced into the market in a timely manner.

We have underway an intensive research and design program on the supersonic transport, supported by appropriations of \$231 million.

The design competition for this aircraft and its engines is intense and resourceful.

I am requesting \$200 million in Fiscal Year 1967 appropriations to initiate the prototype phase of the supersonic transport. My request includes funds for the completion of design competition, expanded economic and sonic boom studies, and the start of prototype construction.

We hope to conduct first flight tests of the supersonic transport by 1970, and to introduce it into commercial service by 1974.

Aircraft Noise

The jet age has brought progress and prosperity to our air transportation system. Modern jets can carry passengers and freight across a continent at speeds close to that of sound.

Yet this progress has created special problems of its own. Aircraft noise is a growing source of annoyance and concern to the thousands of citizens who live near many of our large airports. As more of our airports begin to accommodate jets and as the volume of air travel expands, the problem will take on added dimension.

There are no simple or swift solutions. But it is clear that we must embark now on a concerted effort to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise. To this end, I am today directing the President's Science Advisor to work with the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Secretaries of Commerce, and of Housing and Urban Development, to frame an action program to attack this problem.

I am asking this group to:

- study the development of noise standards and the compatible uses of land near airports,

more

- consult with local communities and industry,
- recommend legislative or administrative actions needed to move ahead in this area.

Advanced Ocean Vessel Concepts

After years of United States leadership, maritime technology in other countries has caught up with and, in some instances, surpassed our own.

The U. S. Merchant Marine suffers in world competition because it bears much higher costs than its competitors. This can be offset in some measure by technological improvements.

The Department of Defense recently launched the Fast Deployment Logistics Ship program. This concept introduces to the maritime field the same systems approach that has proven so successful in other Defense and Aerospace programs.

To achieve comparable improvements throughout the maritime industry I am directing the Secretary of Commerce, with the Secretary of Defense, the President's Scientific Advisor, and the Atomic Energy Commission, to conduct a study of advanced vessel concepts.

The work of this team will include:

- Research, development and planning of high speed, large capacity ships, devoted primarily to transporting pre-loaded containers of varying types between the major ports in the world.
- Research on an ocean-going Surface Effects Vessel capable of skimming over the water at speeds more than 100 knots.
- Continued exploration of the application of nuclear propulsion to merchant marine ships.

Our private shipyards should continue to serve the needs of the Country. They can become more productive and competitive through research and development and through standardization of ship construction. With a new Department of Transportation, we will increase our efforts to bring a modern, efficient merchant marine fleet to this Nation.

Advanced Land Transport

Last year Congress took a long step towards advanced land transportation by enacting the High-Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development program. This program will be continued at the most rapid pace consistent with sound management of the research effort.

Similar vision and imagination can be applied to highway transport.

Segments of the Interstate Highway network already in operation are the most efficient, productive roads ever built anywhere in the world. Motor vehicles move at higher rates of speed, more safely and in greater number per lane than on conventional roads. Transportation costs are reduced, and less land area is needed for this volume of traffic.

With the network about half completed after 10 years, it is apparent that Interstate Highways, as well as other roads and streets, can become even more productive and safe.

more

Accordingly, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce to:

- Investigate means for providing guidance and control mechanisms to increase the capacity and improve the safety of our highway network.
- Conduct research into the means of improving traffic flow -- particularly in our cities -- so we can make better use of our existing roads and streets.
- Investigate the potential of separate roadways for various classes of vehicles, with emphasis on improving mass transportation service.

Systems Research

Some of our brightest opportunities in research and development lie in the less obvious and often neglected parts of our transportation system.

We spend billions for constructing new highways, but comparatively little for traffic control devices.

We spend millions for fast jet aircraft -- but little on the traveler's problem of getting to and from the airport.

We have mounted a sizable government-industry program to expand exports, yet we allow a mountain of red tape paperwork negate our efforts. Worldwide, a total of 810 forms are required to cover all types of cargo imported and exported. In this country alone, as many as 43 separate forms are used in one export shipment. Eighty separate forms may be needed to process some imports. This is paperwork run wild.

I am directing the Secretaries of Treasury and Commerce and the Attorney General to attack these problems, through the use of effective systems research programs. And I have directed them to eliminate immediately every unnecessary element of red tape that inhibits our import and export programs.

Transportation for America

The Founding Fathers rode by stage to Philadelphia to take part in the Constitutional Convention. They could not have anticipated the immense complexity -- or the problems -- of transportation in our day.

Yet they, too, recognized the vital national interest in commerce between the States. The early Congresses expressed that interest even more directly, by supporting the development of road and waterway systems.

Most important, The Founding Fathers gave us a flexible system of Government. Cities, states and the federal government can join together -- and in many cases work with private enterprise -- in partnerships of creative Federalism to solve our most complex problems.

more

For the very size of our transportation requirements -- rising step-by-step with the growth of our population and industry -- demands that we respond with new institutions, new programs of research, new efforts to make our vehicles safe, as well as swift.

Modern transportation can be the rapid conduit of economic growth -- or a bottleneck.

It can bring jobs and loved ones and recreation closer to every family -- or it can bring instead sudden and purposeless death.

It can improve every man's standard of living -- or multiply the cost of all he buys.

It can be a convenience, a pleasure, the passport to new horizons of the mind and spirit -- or it can frustrate and impede and delay.

The choice is ours to make.

We build the cars, the trains, the planes, the ships, the roads and the airports. We can, if we will, plan their safe and efficient use in the decades ahead to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

The program I have outlined in this message is the first step toward that goal.

I urge its prompt enactment by the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

THE WHITE HOUSE,

March 2, 1966.

#

MEMORANDUM

7
THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

RECEIVED
SP2 3/1/66/TN
FG4001MC

5:55 pm. Tuesday
March 1, 1966

FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM Joe Califano *jacn.*

Attached is a list of the Congressmen invited to tonight's briefing on the Transportation Message.

Attach.

LIST FOR TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE BRIEFING
WHITE HOUSE MESS; MARCH 1, 1966; 6:00 P.M.

Acceptances

Senators

Warren G. Magnuson
Mike Monroney
Vance Hartke
Howard Cannon
Ross Bass
John L. McClellan
Norris Cotton
Thruston B. Morton

Representatives

Carl Albert
Harley Staggers
Walter Rogers
Paul G. Rogers
John Bell Williams
James Mackay
Glenn Cunningham
Chet Holifield
John A. Blatnik
John E. Moss
Henry S. Reuss
George H. Mahon
Joe L. Evins
Charles R. Jonas
Wilbur Mills
Samuel Friedel
John D. Dingell
Edward A. Garmatz
William J. Springer
Florence P. Dwyer
John J. Rooney
John Anderson
Daniel J. Ronan

George Fallon

Invited, no response as yet

John Pastore
E. L. Bartlett
Sam Ervin
Robert Kennedy
James B. Pearson
Karl E. Mundt
Carl T. Curtis

Speaker McCormack
Jake Pickle
Jack Brooks
Dante Fascell
~~Daniel J. Ronan~~
Samuel L. Devine

Declines

Senators

Frank Lausche
Daniel B. Brewster
Maurine B. Neuberger
Hugh Scott
Winston L. Prouty
Peter H. Dominick
Henry Jackson
Ernest Gruening
Edmund S. Muskie
Abraham A. Ribicoff
Fred R. Harris
Lee Metcalf
Joseph M. Montoya
Jacob Javits
Milward L. Simpson

Representatives

Hale Boggs
John Jarman
J. Arthur Younger
Howard Calloway
L. H. Fountain
Porter Hardy, Jr.
Robert E. Jones
Cecil King
John Byrnes
William Colmer
Howard Smith
Gerald Ford
Leslie Arends
Torbert Macdonald
Leo W. O'Brien
William L. Dawson
Ogden R. Reid
Frank J. Horton
Frank T. Bow
Robert P. Griffin

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 1, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES ROCHE

There will be a briefing meeting in the White House Mess at 6:00 p.m. this evening on the transportation message. Would you kindly invite the following to attend and coordinate with Glenda.

Pres - Connors
Secy

manley ✓ Speaker John McCormack
 ✓ Gerald Ford *NO*
Sundberg ✓ Leslie Arends *NO*
 Samuel Friedel *yes*
mayan Torbert Macdonald *no*
 ✓ 1861 Leo W. O'Brien *NO*
 ✓ 1071 John D. Dingell *yes*
 ✓ 1006 Daniel J. Ronan *yes*
 ✓ 4372 William L. Dawson *NO*
 ✓ 6161 Edward A. Garmatz *yes*
 ✓ 2371 William J. Springer *yes*
 ✓ 355 Samuel L. Devine *?*
 ✓ 301 Florence P. Dwyer *maybe - lives*
 ✓ 3511 Robert P. Griffin *out of city*
 ✓ 506 Orden R. Reid *NO*
 ✓ 4916 Frank J. Horton *NO*
 ✓ 5936 John J. Rooney *yes*
 ✓ 3876 Frank T. Bow *NO*
 ✓ 5676 John Anderson *yes*

Thank you.

Sherwin J. Markman

19
259
30
78

MEMORANDUM 6

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Transportation meeting tonight White House Mess 6:00 p.m.

✓Carl Albert *yes*
✓Hale Boggs - *no*
✓Harley O. Staggers *yes*
✓Walter Rogers *yes*
✓John Jarman *No*
✓Paul G. Rogers *yes*
✓Jake Pickle -
✓John Bell Williams *yes*
✓James Mackay *YES*
✓J. Arthur Younger *No*
✓Glenn Cunningham *Yes*
✓Howard Calloway - *No*
✓Chet Holifield - *YES*
✓Jack Brooks
✓L. H. Fountain - *No*
✓Porter Hardy, Jr. - *No*
✓John A. Blatnik *yes*
✓Robert E. Jones *No*
✓John E. Moss *YES*
✓Dante B. Fascell - *?*
✓Henry S. Reuss *yes*
✓George H. Mahon *YES*
✓Joe L. Evins *YES*
✓Charles R. Jonas *YES*
✓Wilbur Mills *YES*
✓Cecil King *No*
✓John Byrnes *No*
✓William Colmer *No*
✓Howard Smith *No*

29

*Califano
Lambert*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 1, 1966

Transportation briefing White House Mess 6:00 p.m. this evening

Speaker McCormack
Carl Albert
Hale Boggs
Gerald Ford
Leslie Arends
George Fallon - yes
Harley O. Staggers
Walter Rogers
Samuel N. Friedel
Torbert Macdonald
John Jarman
Leo W. O'Brien
John D. Dingell
Paul G. Rogers
J. J. Pickle
Daniel J. Ronan
John Bell Williams
James Mackay
William J. Springer
J. Arthur Younger
Samuel L. Devine
Glenn Cunningham
Howard Calloway
William L. Dawson
Chet Holifield
Jack Brooks
L. H. Fountain
Porter Hardy, Jr.
John A. Blatnik
Robert E. Jones
Edward A. Garmatz
John E. Moss
Dante B. Fascell
Henry S. Reuss
Florence P. Dwyer
Robert P. Griffin
Ogden R. Reid
Frank J. Horton
George H. Mahon
John J. Rooney
Joe L. Evins
Frank T. Bow
Charles R. Jonas

Wilbur Mills
Cecil King
John Byrnes
William Colmer
Howard Smith
John Anderson

MEMORANDUM FOR MIKE MANATOS

The following have been suggested as invitees to the White House briefing on the President's transportation message to be held in the White House Mess at 6:00 p.m. this evening. Please add or delete as you think best and invite them for tonight. Would appreciate your giving Glenda a list by midafternoon.

Sherwin Markman

The Vice President

Russell Long
George Smathers
Everett Dirksen
Thomas Kuchel

Commerce Committee

Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman	Norris Cotton
John O. Pastore	Thruston B. Morton
A. S. Mike Monroney	Hugh Scott
Frank J. Lausche	Winston L. Prouty
E. L. Bartlett	James B. Pearson
Vance Hartke	Peter H. Dominick
Howard W. Cannon	
Daniel B. Brewster	
Maurine B. Neuberger	
Ross Bass	

Government Operations

John L. McClellan, Chairman	Karl E. Mundt
Sam J. Ervin, Jr.	Carl T. Curtin
Henry M. Jackson	Jacob K. Javits
Ernest Gruening	Milward L. Simpson
Edmund S. Muskie	
Abraham A. Ribicoff	
Robert F. Kennedy	
Fred R. Harris	
Lee Metcalf	
Joseph M. Montoya	

Life Fallon

HOUSE

Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Harley O. Staggers, Chairman
Walter Rogers
R Samuel N. Friedel, Subcommittee
Chairman
R Torbert H. Macdonald
John Jarman
R Leo W. O'Brien
R John D. Dingell (Subcommittee)
Paul G. Rogers
J. J. Pickle (Subcommittee)
R Daniel J. Ronan (Subcommittee)

R William J. Springer
J. Arthur Younger
R Samuel L. Devine (Subcommittee)
Glenn Cunningham (Subcommittee)

~~newly~~
Calloway

~~John Bell Williams~~
James Mackay (G) Government Operations

R William L. Dawson, Chairman
Chet Holifield
Jack Brooks
L. H. Fountain
Porter Hardy, Jr.
John A. Blatnik
Robert E. Jones
R Edward A. Garmatz
John E. Moss
Dante B. Fascell
Henry S. Reuss

R Florence P. Dwyer
R Robert P. Griffin
R Ogden R. Reid
R Frank J. Horton

~~Starnes~~

Appropriations

George H. Mahon, Chairman
R John J. Rooney
Joe L. Evins

R Frank T. Bow
Charles R. Jonas

Mills
Wilbur ~~Mason~~
Cecil Kres
John Byrnes

Ways & Means

Rules
Colmer
Howard Smith
R Anderson (Ill.)

March 1, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR MIKE MANATOS

The following have been suggested as invitees to the White House briefing on the President's transportation message to be held in the White House Mess at 6:00 p.m. this evening. Please add or delete as you think best and invite them for tonight. Would appreciate your giving Glenda a list by midafternoon.

Secretary Connor

Sherwin Markman

~~The Vice President~~

~~Russell Long~~

~~George Smathers~~

~~Everett Dirksen~~

~~Thomas Kuchel~~

Commerce Committee

yes Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman
John O. Pastore
yes A. S. Mike Monroney
No Frank J. Lausche *(in hospital)*
E. L. Bartlett
yes Vance Hartke
yes Howard W. Cannon
No Daniel B. Brewster
No ← Maurine B. Neuberger *women's award*
yes Ross Bass

yes Norris Cotton
yes Thruston B. Morton
No Hugh Scott *has 2 receptions*
No Winston L. Prouty
James B. Pearson
No Peter H. Dominick

Government Operations

yes John L. McClellan, Chairman
Sam J. Ervin, Jr.
No Henry M. Jackson
No Ernest Gruening
No Edmund S. Muskie *(on way to Germany)*
No Abraham A. Ribicoff
Robert F. Kennedy
No Fred R. Harris
No Lee Metcalf
No Joseph M. Montoya

Karl E. Mundt
Carl T. Curtis
No Jacob K. Javits
No Milward L. Simpson

For White House Briefing, President's Transportation Message, March 1, 1966

The Vice President

Senators Mansfield, Russell Long, Smathers and Senators Dirksen and Kuchel

~~Speaker McCormack and Reps. Albert, Boggs, Ford and Arends~~

SENATE

Commerce Committee

D

R

Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman
John O. Pastore
A. S. Mike Monroney
Frank J. Lausche
E. L. Bartlett
Vance Hartke
Howard W. Cannon
Daniel B. Brewster
Maurine B. Neuberger
Ross Bass

Norris Cotton
Thruston B. Morton
Hugh Scott
Winston L. Prouty
James B. Pearson
Peter H. Dominick

Government Operations

John L. McClellan, Chairman
Sam J. Ervin, Jr.
Henry M. Jackson
Ernest Gruening
Edmund S. Muskie
Abraham A. Ribicoff
Robert F. Kennedy
Fred R. Harris
Lee Metcalf
Joseph M. Montoya

Karl E. Mundt
Carl T. Curtis
Jacob K. Javits
Milward L. Simpson

EXECUTIVE

SP2-3/1966/TN
BEH

1966 MAR 1 PM 5 42

T
UVUCP

GA
BOOK OF 4 COPIES

GOVT PD
THE WHITE HOUSE 1

ON BEHALF OF THE PRESIDENT I WOULD LIKE TO INVITE YOU TO A BRIEFING ON THE PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE.

THIS BRIEFING WILL BE HELD AT NOON ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2 IN THE INDIAN TREATY ROOM OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING, 17TH AND PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. PLEASE USE THE PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE ENTRANCE.

I LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING YOU THEN.

JOSEPH A CALIFANO, JR. SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT.

WHB5
x ROBERT SWAIN
x INTL ROAD FEDERATION 1023 WASHINGTON BLDG WASH DC

2436

WHB6
x QUINN TAMM
x INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE 1319 18TH ST NW
WASH DC

WHB7
x C LESTER DENNIS, PRESIDENT
x BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY & STEAMSHIP CLERKS 400 FIRST
ST NW WASH DC

WHB8
x BERNARD HARTUNG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
x INSTITUTE OF TRAFFIC ENGINEERS 1725 DE SALES ST NW WASH DC

CLR PLS ACK
R WHB 5-8 543P THNKS

RECEIVED
MAR 2 1966
CENTRAL FILE

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 28, 1966

JOE:

Jim Reynolds called. He wanted to be absolutely certain that there was no reference in the Transportation Message to an Executive Order setting up a special disputes advisory committee to resolve labor-management frictions in the Maritime Industry.

He talked to Meany about such an Executive Order at the Miami Convention and there are some very serious problems with it. He did say that there should be some mention in the message on the need for labor-management peace as a prerequisite for further industry progress.

Larry

DEFERRED
FG 999-15
TN

FEB 28 1966

①

THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

The draft Department of Transportation bill transfers to the Department the following agencies and functions: (Sec. 6)

- . Federal Aviation Agency
- . Bureau of Public Roads
- . Maritime Administration
- . Coast Guard
- . Office of Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation
- . Great Lakes Pilotage Administration
- . rail and motor carrier safety functions of the ICC
- . car service functions of the ICC
- . safety functions of the CAB
- . bridge and toll functions of the Corps of Engineers

In addition, the President will, by Executive order, transfer to the Secretary responsibility for:

- . St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation
- . Alaska Railroad

The bill does not:

- . Change existing relationships with the regulatory agencies, except for safety
- . Affect the Corps of Engineers, except for a small number of minor functions
- . Change existing functions in the urban transportation area

Urban Transportation

The bill contains no provisions with respect to the Mass Transit program of HUD. It is expected that the Secretary of HUD and the Secretary of Transportation will jointly study urban transit problems -- including urban aspects of highway development -- and make proposals for the appropriate division of functions between the two agencies.

rec'd
9/15/66
C. J. [signature]

Relations with Regulatory Agencies

The Department provides a focal point for the development of proposed transportation policies and for analysis of Federal investment in all modes of transportation. While existing relationships are not changed, the bill amends the Federal Aviation Act to provide that the CAB in considering the subsidy program shall "take into consideration" standards and criteria furnished by the Secretary of the Department with respect to the character and quality of transportation required by the commerce of the United States. (Sec. 8(a))

Organization

All functions, powers, and duties of the transferred agencies, as well as those newly created, are vested in the Secretary. The Coast Guard is transferred as a legal entity; all other agencies will lapse and no longer have a legal status. However, the Secretary is enjoined to consider the need for operational continuity (Sec. 4(b)). Consequently, the FAA, Maritime Administration, and Bureau of Public Roads will be re-constituted by Departmental order immediately upon creation of the Department.

The Department will have four Assistant Secretaries. They will not be in the line, but will be used primarily by the Secretary for cross-cutting department-wide problems such as long range planning and policy development, international transportation affairs, technology and research, etc.

Size

The Department will have a budget of \$5.9 billion, and 94,317 personnel (33,556 military and 60,761 civilian). It will rank fifth in size (in \$) and fourth in personnel (civilian and military).

Safety Functions

The new Department will carry out safety activities for all modes of transportation. In order to determine the cause of accidents, a new National Transportation Safety Board will be established within the Department. (Sec. 5). The Board will

- . Determine the cause of accidents
- . Act as an Appeal Board on airman and mariner certificates issued by FAA and Coast Guard

Accidents will be investigated by the appropriate element of the Department and the investigation results reviewed by the NTSB. To insure independence and objectivity in carrying out these functions, the Board will consist of five Presidentially appointed members, with Senate confirmation.

Purpose of the Department

The Department will coordinate government activities in a vital and significant sector of the economy. The Department will provide leadership in developing for all modes of transportation coherent and balanced programs for research and development, safety, and Federal investment.

In the investment area, for example, any proposal for a Federal investment in transportation facilities or equipment will have to be in accord with standards and criteria established by the Department. (Sec. 7). The Department will also provide basic transportation data and economic analysis for use by agencies in making such investment proposals. In the case of multi-purpose water resource projects, requirements are set forth for appropriate consultation with the Water Resources Council and for compatibility of the various criteria for economic evaluation to be used.

Previous Proposals for a Department

Proposals for a Bureau or a Department of Transportation have been made since 1874. The most important of those in recent years include:

- . (1949) First Hoover Commission Task Force Report.
(Full Commission recommended a Department of Commerce and Transportation)
- . (1961) President Eisenhower in his outgoing Budget Message
- . (1961) U. S. Senate Committee on Commerce staff report
the so-called "Doyle Report"

In each of the past several sessions of Congress bills to create a Department have been introduced by Senator Case and Representative Younger.

Relationship of the Corps of Engineers to the Department of
Transportation

The Corps of Engineers, except for a number of minor functions related to designation of anchorage areas, drawbridge operations, bridge clearances, and toll bridges, will remain outside the Department.

The Corps will, however, employ economic data and certain criteria developed by the Secretary of Transportation in evaluating water navigation projects. The bill requires that these criteria (used in such navigation projects) be compatible with those used in the non-navigation aspects of multi-purpose water and development projects. This does not mean that the criteria must be exactly the same, nor does it mean that economic criteria alone will be used for making decisions on the navigation projects. It does mean that we have consistency in the economic criteria which are used.