

large amounts of oil that are spilt, almost invariably come from American-owned foreign-flag ships—ships which are not operated by American personnel, if you will. We think this question ought to be well in the minds of this committee.

Also, it seems to us that this is a good place for the Congress to at least set the tenor to indicate that people who operate equipment are not responsible for the failures of that equipment. Certainly, insofar as seamen are concerned, they pay particular attention to the equipment they operate because their lives depend upon it. However, as pointed out with respect to the obsolescence of the equipment, there are other built-in features of equipment over which they have no control or no knowledge. Latent obsolescence of equipment or latent defects which show up in equipment obviously merchant seamen can't be responsible for. Yet in the past the tendency has always been to blame the man and not the equipment. We should certainly like to see this committee reverse this trend and put the onus where it should be.

INLAND WATERWAYS EQUIPMENT NOT REGULATED FOR SAFETY

Now a very large segment of our transportation system, the inland waterways equipment is the only segment of our transportation system that is not regulated for safety. Neither the personnel nor the equipment are covered under safety regulations. Certainly this is perhaps the most vulnerable section of our entire industry when it comes to the question of polluting or endangering lives. Some of you are familiar with equipment knocking out bridges and disrupting other forms of transportation endangering entire water supplies of various cities or, if you will, endangering the entire lives of large cities on our rivers and inland waterways through the failure of equipment or failure to have competent personnel on the ships. It doesn't make any difference how competent the personnel is on the ship. If you don't have safe equipment you have a gap in your safety insofar as the public is concerned. You must have safe equipment and safe workmen going together to make this possible.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to ask whether or not there is anything in your agreements or contracts with the owners of the ships equipment about standards so that your men would not be required to man these ships which are dangerous and inadequate and do not meet certain standards.

Mr. HADDOCK. All of the maritime unions have clauses in their contracts dealing with safety conditions, and there are many instances where seamen simply refuse to sail on vessels because they consider them unsafe. However, there are many conditions that would be shown up through Coast Guard inspection of vessels that are not now inspected if they were required to be inspected such as the inland waterways. Obviously the average seaman is not an expert in safety. While he may know his job in the particular equipment he works with, the overall hull and configurations and placement of machinery, and so forth, are quite technical engineering problems and require expert people to deal with it. And this is one of the reasons of course why the Coast Guard is required to inspect our deep sea vessels and one of the reasons why they should be required to inspect our inland ves-