

A100

C100

SENATE NATURAL RESOURCES

January 12, 1972

M I N U T E S

A meeting of the Senate Natural Resources Committee was held on January 12, 1972, in Room 9 of the State House, Montpelier, Vermont.

Sen. Jones: Good morning. This is the Senate Natural Resources Committee. This particular group is especially interested, I think, in the legislation that we are talking about in this committee which is the so-called bottle bill. This is a working session for the committee and we have been rather anxious to get your thoughts on the legislation. It so happens that each member of the committee was supplied a book yea thick from the House committee that has in it all the testimony from all the people who spoke pro and con on this subject. The Senate committee is going over the whole bill as it came to us and also thinking of what we would prefer to have the bill say. We have had no concensus yet, although I have a sensing of what the committee feels and if I had to put it in the fewest words possible, I would say that we have non-returnable containers, not non-returnable bottles necessarily which would be redeemable not at some isolated spot but at very local spots including possibly the place of purchase so that your rural area people don't have to travel a great many miles to redeem the bottles. There have been suggestions made to me as chairman but not to the whole committee that there should be an increase in the fines and that the commissioner of

public safety should be authorized to have at least three troopers in unmarked cars just on the prowl for this and that all of the fish and game wardens should become enforcement officers to the litterers. This is just the input to the committee, there has been no vote, no concensus at this time. It seems some of you have asked to come in. I am delighted that you are here. Before we get going with those from "away", Mr. Martin from the governor's office has asked me if we could hold up making any definite amendments in the committee until he had an opportunity to make a presentation. So I will ask Mr. Martin to give his presentation now.

Mr. Martin: What I would like to do is reiterate the governor's position on the bottle bill. As you will remember, he supported the original bill in the house. It was changed very drastically there and even rewritten. From that time on, because of the obvious difficulty and complexity of this question, the position he has taken is that he supports "a bill" that is number one, effective and, number two, meets the approval of both houses of the legislature. I had asked to come in because Mr. Fayette and others in his organization had been working very closely with the local affairs office on the development of recycling which is a rather new development. which has been very successful in the state in the judgement of the agency. Mr. Fayette has said that his industry recognizes now that something has to be done. I had hoped to be able to meet with them before I came before you. The governor is very anxious to have some progress in this area this session.

Sen. Jones: Mr. Fayette, do you have a suggestion for the committee?

Mr. Fayette: We would like to thank you for allowing us to be here. I am president of the Vermont Bottlers and am also in the beer business. We know that we have a problem in the state of Vermont and fifty other states have the same problem. Everybody is attacking it in a different way and we are all moving kind of fast and I had thought that if we could not come up with an answer this minute because I am planning to have lunch with Pete today and go over some of the plans that we have. I came back from a meeting in Washington and talked to fifty states who had plans in fifty different states and maybe fifty different types of plans. Everybody is groping for the right answer. The big problem I think we all have to face is solid waste. I think the litter problem is great, but I think that solid waste and litter is all one problem. After green-up day we started recycling. We have recycled in Burlington and we have a center open seven days a week around the clock. We are recycling paper and cardboard. In Brattleboro we have a redemption center. We are hoping to use what we have learned in Burlington to recycle throughout the state. It is a big problem. Everybody wants to do something but you have a hard time finding a redemption center, it is not that easy. We have been trying to look for centers in Rutland, Barre, Montpelier so we can set up a center. Where are you going to go? We go to town officials or anybody we can. We have recycled probably three to four hundred thousand

pounds of glass already. We have recycled tons and tons of paper. All of this would originally have been thrown in the dump but this has been recycled. I think they are almost like one problem, but they are two different problems, litter and solid waste. I think we have to look at it realistically and I think the governor and your committee wants to come up the right answer for the good of the state of Vermont and we do. We know we are part of the problem but the glass and cans we are talking about now are less than six per cent of the total solid waste. But we are up there and we are the target for everybody and everybody is trying to regulate our business but we want to be part of the problem, we want to do some of the work that we should do. We are thinking of some of the plans that we had talking to Pete and feeling him out with an idea that we have about recycling in the state of Vermont. There are other people in our group that could be heard, too, I think. I would like to stop now, I will be glad to answer questions later.

Sen. Jones: Mr. McNally is with the Liquor Control Board. We asked him if he could give us some input as to their sensing on the bottle business.

Mr. McNally: If we can answer any questions the committee may ask us we will, but I think this is a problem for the wholesalers. I know that roadside litter is sometimes caused by our regulations or laws where the person is trying to hide the evidence such as empty bottles; and if he is carrying it in his

car he will probably throw it beside the highway. We have seen cases of this where if there is a roadblock and kids don't want to be questioned about bottles in their cars, they'll throw them out beside the road. How great this is is something we don't have any record of. I know I have talked with Maine and they have an open bottle law in that state and they say they have just as much litter in the state of Maine as we have here in Vermont.

Sen. Jones: I think that was one of the reasons we wanted you to come. We were concerned as to whether people would throw stuff out so that they wouldn't be arrested even if you gave a dollar refund on a container. You are saying in effect that, indeed, they would throw them out rather than have the police find them in their cars.

Mr. McNally: We've found that, yes.

Sen. Gibb: Is anybody from the state police here?

Sen. Jones: We were hoping to get an input from the state police on that, too. Good morning, Commissioner Corcoran. We were hoping to get a little input from you on the litter on the highway. We were wondering if the problem would continue even though you put a refund of even a dollar on a can or bottle. Are people throwing them out to avoid being picked up by

your enforcement people?

Comm. Corcoran: I don't believe there is what we call the open container law in Vermont. We have never enforced it if it is here. The open container law that we have in some states means that if you have an open container of any alcoholic beverage in the car it is prima facie evidence of drinking and driving. We have no such law and in my experience with other states, I would not recommend that we have such a law. It leads to poor police work and it certainly leads to littering.

Sen. O'Brien: They tried to pass such a law, we defeated it.

Sen. Christowe: Isn't there a law on the books that requires that liquor must be carried in the trunk of a car?

Comm. Corcoran: I am aware of no such law, Senator.

Sen. Jones: It was suggested by possibly a member of this committee that one thing that might help would be if you were to have three or four unmarked cars cruising exclusively, almost exclusively, at any place in the state for the purchase of detecting the litterers. This is one suggestion, it seems to me this isn't the sort of thing we should put in the law but is a suggestion to you if this is what the committee thinks. I wonder if you

had any comment whether that would help.

Comm. Corcoran: We do this. We are constantly on the alert for litterers. I drive an unmarked car and I cover a lot of area, I have never seen a litterer. The type of person who is a litterer is the type of person who looks in his rear window and if there is no one in back of him, he throws. He is as ashamed of doing it, I believe, as he would be of doing almost anything else. That's my impression. In all of my driving in the state, I have never seen a litterer.

Sen. Christowe: The business of recycling is such a new thing that some of us are ignorant about it. Would somebody explain what solid waste materials are recycled and what happens to the recycled material?

Mr. Fayette: What we do in Burlington is we have the public bring in the glass. We separate the green, the brown, the white. We crush the glass and we ship it back to Dayville, Connecticut. It is recycled at that point. Paper is also sent back to plants in New York State and other parts of the country. It is recycled, in other words it is used again and not thrown in dumps.

Sen. Christowe: How about tin cans?

Mr. Fayette: Not at this point. That is the next step. It is a problem.

Right now, paper, newspaper, cardboard and glass are being recycled.

Sen. O'Brien: Don't you and Coca-Cola pay for that alone?

Mr. Fayette: Right now it's costing about \$400 a week out of pocket.

Sen. O'Brien: Just you two?

Mr. Fayette: No, all of the bottlers and all of the beer people are participating in this. So it's a project. None of us have all the answers. I think in Burlington we are ahead of most states in our recycling for the population factor?

Sen. O'Brien: Getting back to the comment made by the commissioner that he has never seen a litterer. I have done quite a bit of driving and the only litterer I have ever seen was on Main Street in the city of Burlington. I have never seen one out in the country.

Mr. Carbine: May I reply further to the Senator's question? Speaking a little out of what I intended to say, Senator, in response to your question, I represent a Glass Container Manufacturers Institute. That institute represents practically all of the bottlers of the non-returnable bottles. As someone already said here, we have not been idle since the close of the

1971 Session. We have been working, we have been thinking, and we have been doing. We are ready to announce, and this is not something which we thought up for this committee meeting this morning, it is something which we intended to announce anyhow. We are about to undertake a pilot reclamation program in Vermont. By that I mean that in certain specified areas in cooperation with municipal governments and the state highway department we will set up special bins for the reclamation and recycling of glass. This project will not be like Mr. Fayette's very fine program, in that it will eliminate one step and that is the sorting here will not be necessary inasmuch as the ground glass will be used for such things as glass brick or glassphalt which is a road material. This conversion, grinding, will be done in place on the premises in Vermont. We will also (and this will be done by stationary equipment) put on, the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, perhaps with some cooperation from our associated industries, the beer industry, the bottling industry, the distributing business, perhaps the grocers; we need the goodwill, the help of all these people, but this we will do ourselves. We intend to institute this program immediately. And as I say, this is something which we have had under consideration, which we have been thinking out and planning for some time. It is not that we got a call that there was a committee hearing this morning so we say down last night and came up with this pie-in-the-sky idea.

Sen. Christowe: What do you mean by, it will be done on the premises?

Mr. Carbine: Somewhere within the state we plan to have a pilot project. Say, if it is in Windham County, there would be these bins, these Dempsey Dumpsters, around in some of the rest areas, perhaps not all of them, but some of them perhaps twenty-five. Then we would pay to empty those, load them in the truck, and bring them in to a converter somewhere in Windham County. We have not selected Windham County as a pilot area. We have no sites, but we will have. We do have a budget, we do have the appropriations and we are ready to go.

Sen. O'Brien: You will have to raise the price of your product, will you not?

Mr. Carbine: I do not think so. I think that the solution of every environmental problem, the land use, non-returnable bottles, atomic plants, or what have you, involves a balancing of the various interests. Admittedly, I think everybody agrees that litter is a problem; and that the non-returnable bottles are part of that problem. We must do something. The question is what? The answer to what seems to me to be to use the method which will do the least possible harm while accomplishing the good. It seems to me that this bill with its mandatory deposits, mandatory refunding and, perhaps with a mandatory depot for our small grocers, I am not trying to speak for Mr. Smith, but this bill has a suggestion that each grocer, each retail outlet must maintain a deposit depot. That obviously is going to cause a hardship upon the small businessman in Vermont. It is very doubtful in view of the experience of

Pepsi-Cola in New York City that the program will work. I say that the man who throws out the bottle from his car, although I agree with the commission that to a relatively small extent he does it to avoid criminal involvement sometimes the kids do it to avoid daddy finding out about it when he gets home, but I think most of the littering is done because of poor social habits. I don't think that a nickel deposit or as Senator Jones said, a dollar deposit, is going to change those social habits. I do think that this program of ours will cure our problem. Not only will it eliminate the glass part of litter but it will also serve the other environmental purpose which is a very sound purpose and that is that it will eliminate and prevent the waste of the materials in glass and provide for the recycling of that material and the preservation of our natural resources that are used in glass. And I say, gentlemen of the committee, that this plan is worthy of the greatest consideration that admittedly it needs implementation it needs a full presentation to this committee which we are prepared to give. We came up here because of various circumstances without our briefcases, so to speak, some of us having come from hearings elsewhere in the state and some from out of state. We think that this plan of ours has the inherent possibility of accomplishing the social good which everybody admits and agrees should be accomplished without doing social and economic harm to a great many of our citizens. What I would ask the committee to do is hold further hearings, let us make a full presentation of this program and I know that the brewers have a program, too, that works along with this.

I am not going to try to talk about that, I am talking about our own program, but they all have a dovetail, synchronized relationship. We have not, I am speaking now for the industry, we all know that the bottlers under the leadership of Jim Fayette have not stood idle, our progress in the glass industry has been a little less obvious and apparent but nevertheless, we, too, have tried to make progress in the interim and I know others have. I urge that this committee give us the opportunity to make a full presentation.

Sen. Jones: If you should have your system and if there should be a redemption fee on bottles, would you not then have quite a policing problem as far as collection is concerned because you would have these collection points and it would be worth people's while to pick up these bottles, take them to a redemption center and get a nickel back. You'd have to have guards on them, would you?

Mr. Carbine: I think redemption centers would be a great problem, that they would be a tremendous burden to either the wholesaler or retailer. The bottles would be left without payment under our plan. We would not pay for the bottles. We would ask the citizens just to deposit their glass in these containers without payments.

Sen. Jones: Of course, our problem is with the slobs. The decent people are going to do this. How are we going to get the people who throw the stuff out of cars to do that?

Mr. Carbine: I think that if I may, Senator, I know of this program, Operation Pitch-In, which is a program put on by the brewers and Henry or Stanley MacPherson can tell you about that much more accurately than I. I think it answers your question.

Sen. Jones: Has anyone any further questions of Commissioner Corcoran before he leaves?

Sen. Gibb: I would like to find out if there is any policy of the state police regarding a six-pack in a car? I am thinking about fear that the public has of being stopped.

Comm. Corcoran: You are talking in terms of checking ages and that sort of thing?

Sen. Gibb: Yes.

Comm. Corcoran: We only check drivers. I can't recall any arrests and I check alot of arrest forms.

Sen. Jones: They probably think that you do it, that may be our problem.

Comm. Corcoran: We have no announced policy. Individual troopers may have, I really can't answer your question.

Sen. Jones: Thank you very much, Commissioner. We appreciate your coming. We will now ask Judge Black if he will give his presentation.

Judge Black: I have not prepared any formal presentation. However, John mentioned something about the brewers campaign which is directed primarily to litter and this is not something that was developed for the purpose of this hearing. It is a national program involving a great deal of money. The primary purpose of the campaign is to accomplish a reduction in actual quantities of roadside litter. It is an educational program designed to change the litterer's socially unacceptable behavior pattern. For instance, the campaign will be conducted through network television, the entertainment part of the campaign will include such programs as Bonanza, the Bold Ones, Ironside, Gunsmoke, Glenn Campbell, Monday Night at the Movies and quality programs such as the National Geographic Special. About one-third of the budget will be allocated for news programming such as Walter Cronkite and the NBC Nightly News. There will also be magazine coverage, there will be network radio and the campaign will also be conducted in newspapers. It is a very extensive program. I have the figures here as to the cost of it, there is a very great cost. I believe the first network program commences next week on the Today Show, if you folks are familiar with that. Since the last session, as John has indicated, everyone has devoted a great deal of time to this matter and a great deal of thought to it and as far as the gentlemen from the liquor board have reported, because I feel and I know that this committee has gone through some very conscientious

attempts. I know that this committee wants to know something in depth as to what the economic consequences will be of whatever legislation this particular committee recommends. You may say to yourself, well, I think we know the economic impact and perhaps the members of the committee do. To review that for just a moment, the programs contained in the bill that is now before you have very serious impact on Vermonters. They are serious for the wholesaler and his employees, they are serious for the retailer and their employees. They are also serious for the people of Vermont, the consumers. These programs are costly. Often folks will not understand that all beer is purchased by the wholesaler f.o.b. at the brewery. If containers, bottles, are returned to the brewery, you have that additional cost, which is an extensive cost. In addition to that, when we think of the situation along the borders in this state, the New Hampshire border, and I live on the New Hampshire border, and you start for instance Wells River, Woodsville across the river; Bradford, Piermont across the river; Fairlee, Orford across the river; Norwich, Hanover across the river; and then White River Junction with London across the river, Windsor with Cornish across the River; Bellows Falls with Walpole across the river; Brattleboro with Hinsdale across the river . . .

Sen. Jones: I feel hurt that you didn't mention Canaan with Holbrook across the river.

Judge Black: The situation in these areas can be very serious and can very

seriously adversely affect the revenues of this state. For instance, at the present time the beer tax in Vermont is \$7.85 per barrel, in New Hampshire it is \$3.20. The result is approximately a 20 cent difference on a six-pack. On a case it is a difference of approximately 75 to 80 cents. We have that situation now. You add a five cent deposit to a case of twenty-four bottles, you then have a differential of about \$2.00. And with that situation and with New Hampshire still selling non-returnables, we would respectfully submit to you folks that it can adversely affect the revenues of this state to a very substantial degree. In addition to that I am told that skiers who come up from Massachusetts sometimes consume some of our beverage in moderation and with the difference here of almost two dollars and by getting their non-returnable bottles from out of state and bringing them here and not having to return them it will be quite a temptation, I am sure, for them to supply themselves from out of state. I sometimes think of a man in Norwich, Vermont who within the past two years established an agency there, he has the state liquor agency plus beer and wine. With Hanover across the river he has quite a following among the students but I am sure they are not going to his place to buy beer when they can buy it in Hanover in non-returnable bottles. That man has a tremendous volume of business. That 20 cents doesn't seem to bother them but when you add a dollar-twenty cents to a case in returnable bottles then they will not be very anxious to buy on this side of the river. I mention these things because I would respectfully submit that this situation

is not so critical but what study should continue in depth particularly to ascertain what the economic impact going to be. What is the impact on dealers, what is the impact on consumers and what is the impact on revenue for this state?

Sen. Jones: Judge, where would we get the answers to these economic questions, such as the amount of employment involved and the dollar volume of plants and equipment?

Judge Black: The starting place would be the Liquor Control Board. I do not represent the wholesalers. . .

Sen. Jones: Senator O'Brien says they'd have nothing to do with soft drinks, though.

Judge Black: No, but under this particular bill that is before you, they would have something to do with licensing.

Sen. Jones: I think Mr. Fayette could help us here.

Mr. Fayette: I could get the information on the soft drinks. I think there are only eight of us left out of twenty-one bottlers in the state of Vermont.

Judge Black: If I could have an opportunity to search our files, I think some studies have been made as to this.

Sen. Gibb: Could I also ask if Judge Black could furnish us with any written description of this national program.

Judge Black: Yes, I can, sir.

Sen. Gibb: Also, you mentioned that it was going to cost money. Do you have an approximate figure on that? What is budgeted for it?

Judge Black: What I have here is \$2,349,100.

Sen. Jones: What represents what?

Judge Black: In local newspapers, college editions of national magazines, national magazines, funds for labor and ethnic publications.

Sen. Gibb: The association has budgeted \$2,349,100 for a year on a national basis, is that correct:

Judge Black: Yes. There was a study about this in the New York Times last Monday in the advertising section next to the financial section.

Sen. Jones: Thank you, Judge.

Judge Black: We might add that the largest amount is for network television and radio.

Mr. Farrell: I am President for the Vermont Wholesale Malt Beverage Association. I recently returned from an Anheiser-Busch Convention in Los Angeles last week. At that meeting in answer to one of the gentlemen on the committee regarding the economic effect of this type of legislation, a rather lengthy presentation was made on this subject by Busch, III, I am not sure that the transcript of his presentation is available, but I am attempting to get it. I think it would be very informative for the committee if I am able to obtain it.

Sen. Jones: Thank you, we would be glad to have.

Mr. Fayette: Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from Maine tells me that he is prepared at some time of the convenience of this committee to make a presentation

(End of tape)

Mr. Desjardin: I have available to show to you and I am sure it would be very exciting for you, our new Pitch-In program, which is a vast enterprise to alleviate the litter that is on the highways. It is aimed at the people who are littering. It is our contention that legislation is not going to stop the fellow from throwing it out of his car. This is a minor part of the littering. The littering aspects that we are trying to get at are you and I and other people who do, in fact, litter whether we realize it or not. It is a good presentation and it will only take about twenty or twenty-five minutes and it will tell you what our ads are going to be, who it is we are trying to reach. It is an elaborate program. If I could have some time with you next week or later this week or any time within the next twenty-four hours, I'd be glad to give it to you.

Sen. Jones: Perhaps you could discuss it with some of us after the meeting.
Yes, Mr. Fayette.

Mr. Fayette: I would like to make one point. In talking about litter, with all the litter campaigns we have, it is less than .6 of one per cent that are littered of the products that are bought and we are trying to make the 99.4 per cent suffer and it is a problem of education and enforcement of the law. The point is that the Rucklehouse themselves said that getting rid of the bottles is not the answer. If you have returnable bottles, you have a heavier bottle and people will still litter. If we have a

refund of five cents a bottle, I'll have all the bottlers from all over New England bring their new bottles to Vermont because they can manufacture new bottles and bring them here for five cents or less. This is not the answer, if you are too high everybody brings the bottles in. If you are too low it doesn't excite people enough to bring the bottles back. We worked two experiments. We worked an experiment at GrandWay just to prove a point. We put returnable bottles out there, Coca-Cola, myself, 7-Up, Pepsi. We sold it at a dollar a case cheaper than non-returnables. We put mammoth displays up, we had the non-returnables on a shelf where you had to go look for it. The non-returnables still outsold returnables ten to one. And we got less than 20 percent of the bottles back. People say that they do want returnables but they don't really believe in it. Richford, a little town along the border, had 600 signatures that said we want returnable bottles. We had to kiss one retailer to put five cases in on consignment of returnable bottles, because they don't want it. After they're put in, the public won't buy the returnable bottles, so just to bring that point up, littering is such a minute amount, less than one percent, of what's causing all of our problems. If we have the deposit too high, we'll have everybody bringing bottles into Vermont.

Sen. O'Brien: Did you understand you to say, Mr. Fayette, that bottles only constituted six per cent of the litter problem?

Mr. Fayette: Our problem is only six per cent of the total solid waste, bottles and cans. Paper products are over 50 per cent of the solid waste, but we stand out like a sore thumb because everybody points the finger at the beer people and the bottling people. We are only a small, minute part of the total problem. But littering is less than one per cent.

Sen. O'Brien: Have you any figures on the percentage of litter caused by garbage?

Mr. Fayette: I have a book here that has a breakdown of everything they picked up. I would be glad to leave it with you. A survey was made by an outside company. They take six-tenths of a mile in 29 states.

Judge Black: May I comment on that. I am not at liberty to quote this district engineer of the highway department but I will if the committee wants it. He told me one day that he was much more concerned with the cost of picking up household rubbish. He said that was one of the most costly things in the district. If any of you have ever noticed on a Sunday evening or Monday morning, you will find the rest areas overflowing with garbage. It takes a lot of manpower to pick that stuff up.

Sen. Jones: We have some retail grocers here.

Mr. Smith: I am Carl Smith of Rutland. I am Secretary of the Retail Grocers Association. I would like to speak in behalf of the 775 retailers in our state who contribute about \$180,000,000 of business of which about \$25,000,000

represents their beverage business. We feel that we are very much in the middle of this thing because whether we like it or not, the society that we deal with has insisted ever since the Second World War on the convenience of non-returnable packaging whether it is in beverages or anything else that you buy. This is a solid fact that we cannot deny. Another fact that I would like to impress upon you is taken from my own personal survey of over 500 other stores in the past year. I have asked each one of them the question, "Do you have any of your customers who have asked you to handle returnable bottles". My summation of this survey is simply this, the overwhelming majority of these customers insist upon, accept, and gladly pay for the non-returnable package. We as independent grocers handle 70 per cent of the beverage sales in the state so these same people must be your constituents as well as our customers. In the past, in our testimony we have pointed out three major reasons why the retail grocers are very much disturbed about any legislation which would force them to handle returnables. 1) the fact that they are confronted with the unsanitary conditions of bottles. The emphasis today in the food world is on sanitation. This would be contrary to this. 2) Most stores today, because since the World War the number of goods variety has almost doubled leaving us without almost any storage space so they would not be able to handle any empties. 3) the labor cost would be very prohibitive. I would like to say in support of Jim Fayette, John Carbine and Judge Black that we are very willing and agreeable to work along with any of these programs

that they have suggested. We would also make one more further point, that is while beverage industry is grabbing the horns of the dilemma here so to speak and going ahead with the program, I don't think it is quite fair that all the rest of the people who contribute to solid waste should be left off the hook. They should be involved somewhere along the line.

Sen. Jones: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Sheridan: I am Roger Sheridan, former liquor commissioner. The same people who throw the empty bottle out of the car did it even when we had a deposit on them and even when the highway department has numerous barrels all along the highway, these same people instead of driving up to the container and dropping it in, will heave it out the window. I don't know if legislation will correct it now any more than it did before.

Mr. Ziter: My name is Louie Ziter. I run the Quality Market in Barre. I have run that store for thirty-two years and I am an independent grocer. I have spoken before about this. My sincere belief is that the only way we are going to lick this problem is through education. We have to educate our children from kindergarten up and it is going to take a good many years. We can't do it over night. I see children throw something in front of the store and go out and clean it up. I take returnable bottles out of the receptacle right in front of my store and all they have to do

is bring the bottle into the store and get the three cents for it.

I was talking to a friend of mine last night who said he had been up at the Forum in Montreal and he asked how they keep it so clean.

When we see a person doing something, we tap him on the shoulder immediately and say, you know you're not supposed to do that. So let's get to work and educate them the right way.

Sen. Jones: I think we have to terminate now. Has any of the committee anything further? Thank you for coming.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 A.M.