

Also, where a city and a chamber of commerce intervene in a proceeding, we urge them to make one concise presentation.

Mr. BROOKS. Do the examiners just accept it for the record when it is possibly redundant and it is long and drawn out and doesn't contribute much to the real evaluation of their own case?

Mr. WRENN. Mr. Chairman, rather than forget it, I think I would say they give very little weight to it.

Mr. BROOKS. Are the ones that win the ones that have the biggest, fattest material submitted?

Mr. WRENN. No, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I think that would be a case in point that the lawyers would understand. If you just load them up with exhibits it doesn't necessarily help.

Mr. CROOKER. I would like to comment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROOKS. Before you comment, let me add that these long records that are very involved and complicated don't necessarily better represent the various applicant's position; instead, I think they rather obscure the basic issues that the Board later will verify or approve. It is difficult for an independent applicant to compete with a full draft presentation of printed and bound volumes of statistics and exhibits.

Mr. CROOKER. Since the Trans-Pacific decision by the examiner, Mr. Wrenn and I have talked about possible method of simplification. We used the printed sheet that the Internal Revenue Service sends out on which you put capital gains and losses as an example of one sheet that points up a problem. We talked about whether we should have a sheet that invited carriers to state very succinctly the flight equipment they would use if they got the operating authority they sought, the number of frequencies, even their scheduling. We even discussed the possibility of summarizing statistics about particular cities, population, utility connections, bank deposits, building permits, and then stopping. We do not want to cut off counsel for a carrier to try to interpret those statistics and to say, "Oh, yes, they have only so many people, but this is a more well-to-do town—more people travel here because there is a university or there is a State capital." Mr. Wrenn and I have met on more than one occasion since Mr. Park's decision to try to get to the very point that you ably suggest: simplifying and shortening exhibits in future matters.

Mr. BROOKS. I think this is highly desirable because it is obvious that every member of the Board can't read a stack of volumes like that. It is probably not necessary that he read them or look at all those exhibits. You are just asking for the impossible if you think every member of the Board and the General Counsel are going to read them all. They wouldn't have time to do anything else, Mr. Wrenn. I think it merits some real serious thought, because the only way the Board or an examiner can reach a decision is to have usable facts. Facts that you can't extract readily for consideration are unnecessary.

I think that is a fine idea, Mr. Chairman. It takes brains to do it in a short sentence, but anybody can do it in 10 pages. I think the lawyers should draw their pay on the basis of how short and concise and to the point their statement is rather than how long and verbose and how many exhibits they have or how many bound volumes and how many statements they have from the chamber of commerce in every city in that State.