

ALASKA LEGISLATURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE / SUBJECT FILE 86/2

605 SCOMM18: HOUSE SPECIAL COMM. ON PERMANENT FUND 1978-80

computer we threw it away and we got a three million dollar computer. So now we don't know about this computer enough to tell us how much money we're spending. This is one of the situations.

The second situation is again like if you're investing money as a private investor, you can be eaten up by commissions if you're buying and selling and again having lots of fun. But after five or six years, you find out that the commissions will have eaten up all your profits.

It's the same way. We have spent tremendous amounts of money for all kinds of expert advice. The only thing we got out of this was a bunch of expert advice that didn't give us any money.

Okay. So those are the things that we shouldn't do, but what should we do? As far as I'm concerned, I'm speaking as a non-Alaskan---here for 20 years. I've got maybe \$35 or \$40,000 and I can invest it in something. I can buy some land in California or Oregon or Washington. I can buy land in Alaska. I find land in Alaska is about five times the cost of comparable land in California. If I can find land say in Washington for \$2 or \$300 an acre, you can't induce me to invest my money in land in say Delta, if anybody is looking to buy it.

So my idea is I don't want to invest in me; I want to

invest in you, young people in Alaska. I work as a surveyor, I said, and all the people that I work with they're the young. Some of them have more talent and more education than I. Some of the best surveyors are some women that survey for me. They're real hot shots. When they're not surveying, they're not sitting around here doing this. They're taking courses. For the young people in Alaska, are we going to have roads, are we going to have acres that we can let them develop, that we can let them build on? Are we going to let the young people use the resources, their minds, their talent, or are we going to let people like Dr. Walden, Dr. Drew and all the rest of those people decide what we are going to do? Are we going to say have 150 acres or 250 in Big Delta, that you can squat on, do anything you want with it?

If I want to invest in anything, I don't want to invest in government. I don't want to invest in the University. I think that our university has a very, very bad program. We got this because it's ours. I'm saying we got to make our own minds. Thank you.

GRUENING: Thank you. Any questions? Next. Thank you very much. You're the first woman to testify today. I'm glad. No. Wait. Sandra was the first.

WESTCOTT: Well, I wasn't going to testify today but I am one of the young people in Alaska that would like to do something.

First of all, I think I've heard inflation here today.

GRUENING: What is your name?

WESTCOTT: Excuse me, Rynnieva Westcott. I live at
6 1/2 mile Richardson Highway.

I've heard inflation, I've heard a lot of ideas of what we shouldn't do with our money and what we should do with it. I think I'd just like to bring forth a few thoughts. I think the only way that Alaska is ever going to fight inflation is to develop a manufacturing economic base utilizing our renewable resources in a way that is beneficial in several aspects to our cash flow and our destinies. I think we should be re-circulating money in Alaska instead of seeing the money spent in our current flow system where the money eventually, through the economic chain, ends up in the coffers of an industrial corporation on the East Coast. By establishing an industry with our renewable resources, we also decrease the liability on our less than desirable transportation systems from the West Coast.

I think also, by establishing an economic base revolving around our renewable resources, is that we establish once and for all, a stable economy that is composed of production and processing within Alaska versus our current system and our past system of being reliant on the government and on our

boom and bust cycles.

In Kansas this year, farmers are getting \$1.85 per bushel for their wheat. But going back to the cycle that we are living in, by the time it gets here, we're paying a dollar a loaf for our bread. This is what we've got to get rid of or we'll never eliminate inflation.

Of course, the other question is why do we need agriculture here? That question is always brought up. Well, in the lower 48 right now, we're losing prime agricultural land at the daily rate of 5,500 acres per day and while technology increases production, the multiplying factors of population increases kind of pours water on the fire.

Now this land is being lost because of population increases. You have higher home demand. New industry comes in. New services area businesses come in so you're losing land.

Regardless of what our likes are in the way of recreation or any other aspect of life, food is one of the basic requirements of life. Alaska is already in the position where we are highly dependent on importing our foods. I think we should be producing our foods, not only growing our food, but producing--processing the by-products of the initial crops, and taking care of Alaskans. Once we've taken care of Alaskans, then we can use it as an export commodity. Of course, what I'm condoning here is for Permanent Fund monies to be used for low interest loans for agricultural

development. Not just farming, but the actual processing of the products. When I say this, I'm talking about canned goods, frozen goods, lunch meats, the red meat industry, etc., so that we do have the food here. I don't know what the current statistics are, but a year ago we had a seven-day supply of food in the state at any one time. I think it's essential that we have more than that, because with a major strike of our transportation system, most Alaskans would get very hungry. The Alaskans that wouldn't get hungry are going to cause others to starve, because they're out in the stores as soon as they get a hint that there's going to be a strike, buying up all the food products in the stores, and the shelves are empty. Any questions?

GRUENING: Thank you for your statement. Any questions? When you mentioned agriculture, I thought of Charlie's bill and his work to promote it. A question comes to mind of you know, why it hasn't really flown in the past? Maybe you have some insight into that.

WESTCOTT: I don't think our state administration has ever supported agriculture. The federal...

GRUENING: The present one?

WESTCOTT: I'm talking about present and past. The federal

government has never encouraged agriculture development. In fact, there was a team of so-called experts sent here in the 1930's to explore the possibilities of utilizing agriculture lands in Alaska. At that time, they documented that it was unfeasible to utilize the agriculture lands in Alaska because they didn't need it.

Well, basic composition of this panel that came up here were farmers from the Midwest. Naturally, they're not going to want the competition that could be incurred from farming in Alaska. This brings up another point that's probably very far-fetched, but one possible utilization of Permanent Funds money, if the right set-up could be established, would be to buy some of the agriculture lands from the federal government.

GRUENING: You mean some of the D-2 lands that are proposed?

WESTCOTT: Not specifically D-2. There are lands in the D-2 that could be utilized for agriculture that are class 2 and class 3 soils. Of course, the federal government has told us that we don't have class 1 soils because of the climatic limitations within Alaska.

PARR: I'd like to reinforce what Ms. Westcott said. Of course, the bill which Governor Hammond vetoed would have been, at least, a start, first step in the direction of agriculture in

the Interior.

But I know that Dr. Burton from the university has published a series of studies on agriculture in Alaska. He may be a little optimistic but his figures indicate that we would eventually have about a \$4.4 billion agricultural sales in the state at an investment cost of about \$3 point something billion per year. So about a billion dollar's profit a year in agriculture alone. It may be a little optimistic but they are big numbers. It does require a big investment.

I think, those of us in the Interior, certainly look at agriculture as being one of the prime sources, prime targets for investment in the Permanent Fund.

WESTCOTT: I think there's a few aspects of the legislation, although I endorse the concept of it, that I have certain problems with. One is agriculture rights. These rights have never been clarified in documentation as to exactly what agriculture rights will be.

First of all, agricultural rights are going to have to be a bankable commodity that the farmer has. The other thing is, of course, that people do not invest their lives in something they don't own. What I mean by that, say a farmer lives on his land and farms it for 25 years and through circumstances that are beyond his control, he becomes vitally ill. He is the bread winner in the family, and he is going to be forced to

sell his property to pay for his medical bills and support his family. This is one thing that should be taken into consideration on agricultural rights. The way it was defined in the Delta land use study, if the land was not farmed, it would revert back to state ownership. This is not owning land.

GRUENING: If I may just comment, I appreciate your testimony on that. One of the problems around the Anchorage and the Mat Valley is that land is rapidly eaten up by subdivisions. Now I think, one of the points to try to restrict it to farming was to prevent the Mat Valley situation. Maybe that's not the way to do it, but I am too concerned with the fact that more and more farmland is irreversibly converted to other purposes. Once you get a subdivision on it, it's not going back to farming.

WESTCOTT: Well, this is correct. You shouldn't be able to subdivide farmland, but the other thing is, of course, that the farmer can sell the land to another farmer. But the way it's written up, if you can't farm the land, it reverts back to the state ownership.

I'm not saying this is the way that agricultural rights will be defined, but they haven't defined it yet. No one is going to go in and purchase land from the state until they know what they have. This would be the same circumstance with Permanent Funds. How can

you take money that has been raised through revenues of non-renewable resources and loan it to someone without clarification that he does have control on the land? Of course with your state system, it's fine and great because it's the state's money; it's the state's land if it's reverted back to the state. Nobody loses. It loses some of the personal property appreciation that individuals have.

GRUENING: Okay. I understand that. Any other questions from the committee? Thank you very much.

VOICE: Could I make another comment?

GRUENING: I'd much...we have a plane to catch. I'd like to hear from you if we have time. But I'd like to hear if anybody else who hasn't testified would like to. Is there anybody out there who would like to make a comment? That hasn't testified. Mr. Murphy.

MURPHY: Like most of the people, Representative Gruening, I didn't plan to testify, so the gist of the...

GRUENING: Could you give your name, just for the record?

MURPHY: My name is Frank Murphy. I live at 308 Noyes Street. The gist of the testimony seems to be as how we might invest the Permanent Fund. I was wondering, my understanding of the Permanent Fund was a safety valve against the day when our declining oil revenues no longer supports the state's budget. I was wondering, if that was the case, perhaps the paramount criteria for how we spend the money is the amount of return we get on it. Is that a correct view of the Permanent Fund or...I guess that's a philosophical question.

GRUENING: That's what we're asking you. That is one philosophical stand that I've heard a number of people state. But there are others, if you sat through today, you'll see there are other goals that people are interested in.

MURPHY: The General Fund is probably more flexible than the, and possibly larger in dollars and cents than the amount of money in the Permanent Fund. It would address itself to most of these investment names which I thought I would agree with, as far as developing Alaska.

But in terms of, and I don't know whether we are going to have people project this situation that the state might be in 10, 20 years down the line, of not being able to support its operating expenditures due to a decline in oil revenues. If we are

faced with that, the Permanent Fund then would be our guarantee against being in that embarrassing situation and should be defended as such would be. And that's all I really wanted to say.

GRUENING: Thank you, Frank. Any questions from the committee? Thank you very much. Is there anybody out there who hasn't had a chance to testify? Yes, sir.

MORGAN: I guess somebody's got to be last. I'm Ray Morgan. I live at 2½ mile Farmer's Loop Road sometimes and sometimes on a homestead across the river in Delta Junction, which I'm still trying to improve upon. I'd like to take off probably where Rynnieva left off and say a little bit about what I'd like to see about the Permanent Fund and also zero in a little bit on the agricultural possibilities in Alaska.

First, it's been my impression since we've been talking about, what I've read in the news media about the Permanent Fund and it was supposed to have been a Permanent Fund for the development of renewable resources in Alaska taken from the non-renewable resources. I guess in the last few months or a year or so we've changed that, so now, also including non-renewable resource development in this, and this I would not argue with. I think we need the non-renewable resource development along with the renewable resource.

I would like to see about half of the non-renewable resource funds put into the Permanent Fund. Just using the interest on this money for the development of non-renewable resources.

There are four non-renewable resources as I see it in Alaska that should be a part of this development. I'd put on the bottom of the list, I think, tourism. I think tourism is a renewable resource, whereby funds can be used to help support this industry.

I think the third one I'd put would be the fisheries industry. Fisheries have certainly not been explored very much in Interior Alaska, but is one of the biggest incomes we have in the state. Probably the second one outside of all our mineral industry today probably I'd say would be the timber industry. This is not again in Interior Alaska, has not been talked about, has not been explored very much at all.

The first one, I think, the top priority I'd put would be agricultural development. Last year we exported from Alaska about \$100 million to buy food that we can produce here in the state. If you take this, carry this out over another 10 year period, you can see this is going to master quite a few hundreds of millions of dollars that we're going to send down to Seattle and to California and other states to buy the food that we can produce here. I'm not talking about food that we can't produce here, just the food that we can produce, the red meat and about 35 different kinds of vegetables.

What I'd like to see us do is to provide funds for two phases

of an agriculture program that we don't have.

One is for the infrasturcture to help support an agriculture program. Without an infrastructure to help support it, we will never succeed in agricultural program. I think the 5,000 acres the state is going to sell in the Tanana Loop area down to Delta Junction will never become an agriculture supporting program. It will become a lifestyle where people want to live in the rural area and will become a kind of a rural homesite, the kind of area that I like to live in too, but I can't afford to do it. Suppose the infrastructure means the machinery dealers, the repair stations, the warehouses--- this is the kind of infrastructure I'm talking about. You can imagine now we don't have that in Alaska. It's almost comparing a railroad to a---what do you have if you have a railroad without tracks or without a railroad yard? You have to have an infrastructure to support the railroad. You also got to have this to support an agriculture program.

The second thing we don't have in agriculture program goes along with infrastructures and marketing system. Until we get a marketing system developed to market within the state and outside the state, the things that we can produce and program jobs for the unemployed and the underemployed, we will again be doomed for failure in any kind of an agriculture program.

So I'm talking about---think I've said this---use the

Permanent Fund, the interest from the Permanent Fund and allow it to be controlled by the people in the state, as some other people have said, let's keep control of that 50% of the non-renewable money that we have and let's spend the interest on it and save it for, the principal part of it for the children that's coming along. I've got three that'll probably be in the state for quite a long time after I'm gone. I'd like to see them have a part of this. But the agriculture program, I think the marketing system and the infrastructure that it takes to support an agriculture program---without those we're going to see some more Matanuska Valley, like you folks have seen in Anchorage, happen right here in the Tanana Valley too. Thank you.

GRUENING: Thank you, Mr. Morgan. Are there any questions?
Mike.

DOOGAN: I'd like to make a statement for the record. There is nothing in the law right now that stipulates that the Permanent Fund will be used for development in Alaska; there is, however, nothing in the law that stipulates that it will not. One of the purposes of these hearings is to find out what people think about that proposition.

GRUENING: I had one question. You know, I know so little about agriculture that I hate to make any statements, but I have

a question in my own mind of why it hasn't flown in Alaska. I've heard this has been suggested that in the Outside agriculture business, called the agribusiness, it's huge, through its massive size and efficiency, can out-compete anything we do up here. Now does that mean to compete we have to get on the same scale? What advantages do we have that would enable us to, say, produce food as cheaply without, say, heavy subsidy as is done Outside?

MORGAN: I think I'd include agribusiness enterprise in this infrastructure as a part of it. And yes, there is a volume that has to be produced before you can do it economically an agriculture program. Some of the folks at the university have said---it's the best information they have---that about a barley development project, the minimum is needed to support the infrastructure, the marketing system to be able to go in the state.

This, of course, is what the governor's planning for the 70,000 acres in Delta Junction. I think we have never had that volume to be able to support the infrastructure, the machinery dealers, the kind of equipment that is needed to be able to supply the market for our own use, and this is why today we're importing about 96% of the food we consume.

GRUENING: Do I understand your proposal that the interest

from the Permanent Fund earnings would be used to help agriculture or was it that actual investment of the principal of the Permanent Fund would be used? Or both?

MORGAN: No. I think I'd like to see just the interest used for the promotions of the non-renewable resources as well as some other kind of economic developments like a phosphorus mining operation, a petrochemical operation which would supply the state, other kinds of nitrogen for agricultural programs. I think these too would need to come along with---to support the non-renewable resources too. Using just the interest, right, not the principal.

GRUENING: Now what about---agriculture would receive loans or grants from the interest---is that the thrust?

MORGAN: I would not say grants. I would say we would receive loans. Yes. I'm not too much in favor of grants.

GRUENING: Okay. Any other questions? Charlie.

PARR: Only one. I might comment, of course, as it was pointed out by somebody, must have been a few minutes ago---there will also be money available in the General Fund, which can be used for some of these things. It wouldn't necessarily have to come---all of the agriculture help wouldn't have to come out of the Permanent Fund monies.

GRUENING: There was a newspaper article, I think it was in the Anchorage papers---it may have been statewide---about some of the defaults in the agriculture loan program, the state agriculture loan program. In other words, the loans are in default and the state isn't getting paid back on some of them. I think we want to try to avoid that. Any suggestions we can have, and maybe it's the fault of the way it's administered. But I think we want to, if we're going to put more money into it, we want to discover what went wrong.

MORGAN: I think this is true. And again, I'd say any of the reasons for the defaults has been just a lack of volume. You just cannot operate an agriculture program in the state of Alaska unless you have the volume to support the infrastructure and the marketing system, those two things. Until you're willing to invest in those, I think it's doomed for failure. I'm sure the agriculture program in 5,000 acres in Delta Junction will never succeed as an agriculture program. It'll be a lifestyle, that some people who buy the land, have agriculture rights, will be living there. That'll be about basically it.

GRUENING: Okay. Since our time is limited, we're only going to have one or two witnesses. We may try to make that

plane. Is there anyone who hasn't testified yet who would like to?
Yes, ma'am, why don't you comment on that?

WESCOTT: Can I just speak from here?

GRUENING: Why don't you speak in the microphone? We're recording this. We'd like to preserve it.

WESTCOTT: You are referring to the agricultural revolving loan fund---correct? I think one of your basic problems with that program is that it's very political and very isolated. You have a recommending board, that is made up---the majority is made up from the Palmer area, residents of the Palmer area. I have seen case after case where a loan is approved through that program more on who knows who than the actual economic basis of it. That would be my only comment on it.

GRUENING: Well, I appreciate that, because you can see that same problem facing the fund. We can have it all go out in bad loans, depending on who Permanent Fund managers are. We have a real problem.

WESTCOTT: In fact, I think you may be aware of the fact that Bill Lewis, who is director of agriculture, was dismissed three

months prior to a new director being put into the office basically because he was going against one loan on the basis it was not backed up properly with collateral; it was not an economic venture that he thought was a good banking loan. It was approved after he was dismissed from his office.

GRUENING: Do you have any comments, suggestions on how these loans might be administered differently?

WESTCOTT: I don't have any suggestions. I have suggestions of what not to do, and that's to set it up the way the revolving loan fund, is, with just a geographical board sitting in Palmer making the decisions for a statewide development program.

GRUENING: I sense also that you feel too many of the loans aren't getting up in this area. Not enough of the money is getting to this area.

WESTCOTT: I think that would be a legitimate complaint. Yeah.

GRUENING: Okay. You, Mr. Bravarney, is that it? Could you make it short, because there's one other comment in the back? Thank you.

BRAVARNEY: Very short. I want to briefly state a couple

other things. I'm from Pennsylvania originally. We folks are Polish people, many of them were farmers. I've seen exceedingly skillful, dedicated people with small farms. My attitude about farming and growing things---you can grow on two acres; you can grow on two million acres. You got to be a farmer. That's all there is. I have a degree in forestry from the University of California, 1954. We didn't know economics. We had chemistry, physics, mathematics, botany, and all those things. We didn't know too much about economics. (inaudible)...a hell of a successful forester. Wouldn't mind seeing (inaudible)...farmers for, if they think they've succeeded (inaudible)...It's the same with farmers (inaudible)...I could perhaps go to an area and maybe have (inaudible)...sort of thing. I could put the type of energy that it would need into developing something, young people can. Right now this (inaudible) business, but everything comes to Alaska late. (inaudible)...the university is notorious for that. They get the (inaudible)...There's a nice thing about this great, big (inaudible) Marxist Socialism. If it's succeeding here, (inaudible) is falling in other places. (inaudible)...but in many cases, it isn't. It (inaudible). There are lots of...the state is (inaudible)...We can't plow the ground with (inaudible)...

GRUENING: I think there'll be a hearing some other time on the university.

BRAVARNEY: We're not developing students; we're developing PhDs. Thank you very much.

GRUENING: Thank you. I saw Mr. Spencer enter the room, and since everyone has testified, did you want to say something, Jerry? We're trying to catch a plane out, not because we want to get out of town, but because we have another hearing tomorrow.

SPENCER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had a couple thoughts. I'll try to be brief. I appreciate very much your coming to Fairbanks and collecting opinions on this Permanent Fund idea, which I don't really know much about, but it seems to me it's got some extraordinary possibilities.

GRUENING: Excuse me. Could you identify yourself please, for the record?

SPENCER: I'm sorry. Yes. Jerry Spencer. I'm a 17-year resident of Fairbanks and director presently of the Fairbanks Town and Village Association. We're a regional, non-profit development organization.

I think the only thought I had to offer to you, I'm sure you've heard some very good testimony this morning---when I was here. I'd like to second many of Mr. Wallis' and Mayor Carlson's thoughts on the nature of the Permanent Fund and these

types of investments and so forth. Some of my concerns, though, have to do with, you know, just the whole idea of how you deal with a billion dollars or two billion dollars in a state this size with 400,000 people in it.

The state's budget this year---and Mr. Gruening, I think you and I would probably find a great deal in common on how the state spends its money---but the idea of a billion, one hundred million dollar budget is just overwhelming to me. The idea of the Permanent Fund having, you know, what are we talking about, two billion dollars in it a few years down the line. This is just mind boggling as far as I'm concerned.

As you deliberate how to manage this thing I would hope that there'd be not only decisions on how the fund is to be allocated in terms of what kinds of things are financed, but you spend a great deal of time on how, you know, the general public is going to be able to keep in contact with the managers of the fund.

As far as I'm concerned, the general public doesn't have much to do at all of the expenditure of that---talking about how you accept policies, how you set up administrative practices in the spending of the billion dollar state budget. I think it's causing some serious problems. That may be an unfair statement, but I feel that people just don't feel like we have the management tools to manage that kind of money. I feel it often myself.

Now you're contemplating something of this sort, which is really

going to make Alaska, I would assume a force in the international money markets. People of Alaska are going to want to watch that very closely. They're going to want to feel they've got good communication with the evolution of the fund. You can't set up administrative mechanism at the front end and just sort of say that's all we need to do with it. This thing is going to evolve day by day in terms of the theory, the thinking about it, how the money's going to be spent, how you're going to allocate parts of it, whether you're going to spend a bunch on rural communities, whether you're going to dump a bunch in the banking system, whether you're going to get involved in investments in Saudi Arabia, or whatever.

The public, you know, that device for making sure the public is constantly in tune with the evolution of the fund, I think is equally as important as deciding how to spend the money---more important, because without that, you're going to be---distance I'm afraid is going to be so great that you're going to have a serious credibility problem and a constant political hassle. We've had enough of those. I'd like to see less of them in the future. As long as we've got this immense gap between the people and their understanding of how to spend or even consider a billion dollars, I think that's where I would recommend the committee and other interested in the development of this fund---I hope they would spend a good deal of time on that.

going to make Alaska, I would assume a force in the international money markets. People of Alaska are going to want to watch that very closely. They're going to want to feel they've got good communication with the evolution of the fund. You can't set up administrative mechanism at the front end and just sort of say that's all we need to do with it. This thing is going to evolve day by day in terms of the theory, the thinking about it, how the money's going to be spent, how you're going to allocate parts of it, whether you're going to spend a bunch on rural communities, whether you're going to dump a bunch in the banking system, whether you're going to get involved in investments in Saudi Arabia, or whatever.

The public, you know, that device for making sure the public is constantly in tune with the evolution of the fund, I think is equally as important as deciding how to spend the money---more important, because without that, you're going to be---distance I'm afraid is going to be so great that you're going to have a serious credibility problem and a constant political hassle. We've had enough of those. I'd like to see less of them in the future. As long as we've got this immense gap between the people and their understanding of how to spend or even consider a billion dollars, I think that's where I would recommend the committee and other interested in the development of this fund---I hope they would spend a good deal of time on that.

GRUENING: Thank you, Mr. Spencer. You just mentioned one of the more difficult problems and that is how you make the funds responsible to public need yet not, let's say, acceptable to a lot of political maneuverings where you have bad loans made because your friends are asking for loans. Any suggestions you have along that line would be helpful.

I only can say that the General Fund is managed by, of course, the executive; but the budget is made up by the legislature. If you don't like the way the legislature does it, you can always vote the legislator out of office. With the Permanent Fund, if you have a structure that doesn't have elected officials, I don't know how you would directly respond. So we have a difficult problem.

SPENCER: These comments that I am making now, by the way, have no parties in cast to them at all. I think it's a problem both Democrats and Republicans are going to have to address themselves to.

You know, you're quite right. The legislature, there's a term for it---the legislature appropriates, the administration spends. The nature of the spending is a problem for both branches. I think it's a serious problem and it's going to get worse, I suspect, because I don't see that the people are that concerned about the mechanism for managing all of this money. You know. And I'm not talking about the services people receive. I'm talking about how you actually put the policy together with the administrative mechanisms and the

communication with the people that, I think, is necessary constantly. I just don't see that. I don't see much movement towards trying to develop those things. That's my concern. I appreciate your...

GRUENING: Any questions? Thank you very much. Has anyone not testified who would like to? Yes, sir.

LAUESEN: My name is Elstun Lauesen. I live at 2416 Gillam. I assume that you're after some broad, general ideas. You're just here to get people's feelings.

GRUENING: To get a nutshell. What's your philosophy on the Permanent Fund?

LAUESEN: Alright. In a nutshell, I feel that the Permanent Fund should keep a...let me read from my notes here, because I have a lot of ideas and I want to get them out systematically. Alright.

I want you first to consider this---that public equity and private equity are fundamentally different, because the definition of value changes as one moves from consideration of the public good to concern for the private profit picture.

I feel that, as much as the Permanent Fund is capable of

doing so, that it should be considered a public trust. While remaining secure, it must have the flexibility to penetrate the thick overlayer of corporations and institutions that exist in the state and be able to reach the individual and the group who have a legitimate and reasonable need for funding.

The question is what defines reasonable.

I would like to suggest then that the major criteria for the reasonable kind of development to be encouraged by the Permanent Fund and also for the Renewable Resources Fund is principal of economic self-sufficiency for the Alaskan People. That is a real public equity, but that would be an investment nightmare.

I envision the development of both production and distribution co-operatives in this area as large numbers of individuals undertake programs of resource-pooling in order to deal with long-term unemployment which exists here, either by circumstance because of the seasonal nature of a lot of the work here, or by choice, by those individuals who seek to be de-intensify the economic future of their lives. I see nothing subversive or wrong with this. There's a lot of people who are trying to approach that kind of style of living. Now obviously these are not the kinds of conditions that traditional money-managers would enthusiastically embrace, but they are on the horizon. I see them increasing. They will require servicing.

Excuse me for breathing into this microphone, but...I would

like to see two conditions, therefore, created within the Permanent Fund and Renewable Resources Fund. First I would suggest a generous allotment of capital for risk, what I call risk capital or venture capital based upon the assumption that the public equity derived from programs and projects designed to foster self-sufficiency are worth the more liberal risk structure.

And number two---the uses of the fund be monitored by public agencies as well as the Permanent Fund committee because of the range and the special condition of these investments will require an understanding kind of review and analysis. For instance, the Cooperative Extension Agency might be the review agency for family and small group investments dealing with commodity production, such as small agricultural cooperatives. Risk capital is review analysis. The latter is important because in some cases the only public equity would be the knowledge derived from the risk taken. This would include individual excursions and alternative energy resources in the building of their homes or whatever.

I'm of the conviction that the existence of risk capital might ignite success in community terms. For each enterprise it successfully interfaces with community need and lending, thereby, a greater self-sufficiency to the community as a whole, represents a public equity and not measurable in dollars.

I wanted to bring this thing, but I didn't get a chance to type it up, that is illustrating this whole point through the development of food cooperatives. In an attempt to quickly establish a source of local economic developments infrastructuralization, where there is a cooperative arrangement between producers and consumers to avoid what, in the future, is going to be a spiralling cost in macro-economic factors affecting Safeway stores and that kind of thing. We have to localize our production and localize our development.

GRUENING: You can submit a written testimony any time later on.

LAUESEN: Okay. I have just one final thing before you off to the airplane.

I would like to end this part of my testimony by questioning the advisability of what may have called the tools of the money managers. By encouraging large scale investment, you create an elite class of borrowers. Unlike that gentleman, I think either loan guarantees or syndicated loan arrangements should be de-emphasized because it is the internalization of the Alaskan economy, that I believe, ought to be encouraged, along with, I'd like to add, stabilization of the economy.

Even if these conditions weren't such huge blocks of capital unless it is a sizable project, which I would submit, might be more efficiently and effectively funded co-ventured or owned by

the state directly rather than having to launder it through private enterprise in order to give a patriotic or traditional appearance to your undertakings. This is precisely the condition that I fear the Hammond administration recently proposed to \$750 million loan guarantee to El Paso's gas lines.

In any case, I realize that the Permanent Fund will represent a considerable sum, but we're not under any gun to invest it as fast as we can. If the business community is worried about the Permanent Fund maintaining parity with the eroding value of the dollar and thus urge us to "put our dollars to work" I would suggest that the logical thing would be to ignore the advice of the so-called Alaskan business community and convert the holdings of our Permanent Fund from the all-American dollar to the Canadian dollar and sit on it. Thank you.

VOICE: Could I ask the gentleman a question?

GRUENING: I would like to let this go into debate, but I saw Mr. Dempsey come into the room. We are debating whether we're trying to catch the plane. If you...

VOICE: No. That's okay. Thanks.

GRUENING: If anyone has a written statement that they want to make later, please feel free to submit it to the committee. Is there anyone who hasn't testified who would like to? I want to thank everyone for turning out. I've enjoyed this. I really have. And I plan to come back to Fairbanks before we recommend anything final to the legislature. Thank you.

Proceedings
of
The House Special Committee on the Permanent Fund

PUBLIC HEARING
September 15, 1977
Anchorage

Rep. Clark Gruening, Chairman
Rep. Terry Gardiner, Vice Chairman
Rep. Ernie Haugen
Rep. Russ Meekins
Rep. Bill Miles
Rep. Leo Schaeffer
Rep. Rick Urion

GRUENING: Good morning. We'll call this meeting to order. We've got a list of people that want to testify and I think there are some that are not on the list and we'll just take you down on a Quaker basis. You raise your hand and come forward and testify. Don't let the ads put you off. I saw the ad in the paper that this was called the House of Permanent Fund like the House of Pancakes. This is the House Special Committee on the Permanent Fund.

Representative Ernie Haugen on the committee from Petersburg told me this morning that he heard on the radio that this meeting was to hear from you folks on how to spend the fund. I can assure you that is not our intention. We want to hear we can preserve that fund and we are just as interested in what you don't want the fund to do as what you want it to do.

We had a very interesting hearing in Fairbanks. We heard a lot of what people wanted it to do and what they didn't want it to do. Since it's your fund and before we actually draft specific legislation for consideration of the whole legislature, we want to hear your philosophical approach. So this is---don't feel you have to be an investment banker. We are really talking about philosophy today.

Also with the committee is Representative Bill Miles

and Representative Russ Meekins who is on the committee will be here shortly. Our A.A. to the committee is Mike Doogan and he may be asking some questions today. Do you have any statements, anybody, that you would like to make? OK, our first witness is Senator Joe Orsini.

ORSINI: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to make a little pitch here. I will be brief. My concern is not at this point with what the use of the Permanent Fund is going to be, but how the uses are determined. To a large extent, the legislature will undoubtedly set broad policy guidelines, but the actual management of those guidelines will be done by some body or some group of people and I'd like to address my remarks to how that group of people come into being chosen.

The Permanent Fund was overwhelmingly adopted by the public last year, as we all know. I suspect that your hearings are turning up a variety of opinions when it gets down to the specifics of how that money is going to be used. I would also imagine that probably there isn't a great deal of coalescence of public opinion at this point and people are kind of vague about it except for those people who happen to be in investment or other kind of industry that is directly involved with it. I would also suspect that, despite the good efforts of this committee in trying to get the issue before the public, that until something really happens or

until the fund is viable such that the impact is being felt substantially in whatever corners that money is going to be spent that the general public will not become involved in this. I could be wrong, but I think that is likely to happen.

On the other hand, people who are knowledgeable about such things as large investment fund maintain that those who control this fund will be extremely powerful in a political-economic sense in the state and probably to the extent that the size of the fund in the next 5-10 years is probably unprecedented with respect to any other state in the Union as a proportion of our state budget. This concept of the power of the fund manager will probably come to pass.

For these reasons, it is my opinion that the managers of the fund ought to be people who are directly accountable to the people, the voters and the general public of the state as opposed to being selected by some other secondary method --- as a panel selects potential people from whom the governor selects. This is sort of a circuitous approach which, in my opinion, ought not to be implemented. I think that one man ought to be directly accountable to the public. As the public sees a need for change in the way in which that fund is invested or used, that change will be reflected in the debate when these people run for their office. And, of course, it

ought to be a full pay, full time office, not just a token or a commission, but a full time, full pay position. The people that run for that, I would think, the public would demand that they have some ability and expertise in handling money in that it is more strictly aimed at than, say the legislature, which is a very broad type thing.

I think the problem with, say, a gubernatorial appointment is that every four years the governor runs for election and there are many, many issues that the governor has control of or discusses and the Permanent Fund will be lost in so many other issues that the governor is involved in --- any governor. I think that this is important enough that they ought to be separately elected.

The frames of the constitution, the state constitution, of course, determines that the governor is the one that has the appointing authority and there are no other elective officers on a statewide basis other than the legislature. But I think that the constitution was framed more than 20 years ago and the state has changed its standards. And we are into an area now, with the oil starting to flow, of a yet greater change than we have seen in the past. And this change should give one reason to take another look at the constitutional concept of only the governor being elected and look at those kind of offices that are perhaps of genuine statewide importance and have statewide input for that particular concern.

That's really the extent of my testimony. I would urge you to take a look at the concept of having elected people managing the funds. It can be done without changing the constitution as long as the governor has some choice, you could have an elected official---is what I'm told by the Legislative Affairs Agency. Of course, the cleanest way is a constitutional amendment.

GRUENING: Thank you, Senator. Can you stay for a few questions? Any questions from the committee? Representative Haugen.

HAUGEN: Senator, how did you set up the---you mentioned qualifications for the fund manager---that it would have to be people with experience. Have you got any idea as to how you would qualify that? How would you set these qualifications up?

ORSINI: I wouldn't. I would let the public---presumably ---running for the legislature, there is---you don't have to be particularly have to be an expert in anything. The legislature deals with all kinds of things.

I think the Permanent Fund is different. It is a function of investment. I would think that the public would always

vote for those people who at least have some sort of ability or have evidenced some sort of experience in finance. Maybe he's been a banker, maybe he's been a union fund manager, maybe it's been a whole raft of things that have become involved in the financial implications.

HAUGEN: But you would first have the public set up the background essentials and then ...

ORSINI: No. I think it ought to be an elective office, period, with no other than---I would have no more restrictions on that office than I would have on an office of the legislature.

HAUGEN: Oh, I see. I thought you were implying that you wanted restrictions.

ORSINI: No. I think the public, as the public, will vote for those people who have some of those qualification.

HAUGEN: OK, thank you.

GRUENING: Mike.

DOOGAN: Senator, have you given any thought to whether these people should be elected on a statewide basis or by region or anything like that?

ORSINI: I would support a district basis to assure that there are a variety of interests. I suspect that you are hearing from various parts of the state has borne that out. That different parts of the state do have different concepts as to how that fund should be used. I think that on a district basis it would be preferable. It may be, my suggestion would be some combination of existing election districts where you group---an individual would run for a seat that would be comprised of several election districts so that you wouldn't have the new election districts to try and fit in.

GRUENING: Senator, you hit on probably one of the more difficult issues for the legislature and that is the issue of control. When you have a sizable fund, people are concerned about who is going to control it. It occurs to me that what we'd have there is---we'd be establishing two legislatures to the extent that you increase the size of the Permanent Fund, you'd have a competing legislature. And whether you needed a constitutional amendment or not, I think you do. Do you see any problem with establishing essentially two

legislatures and---with a very strong executive in this state? Wouldn't that kind of tip the balance in the constitution where we have a legislature, although not, maybe not a match for the strong executive, at least it is one body and has the power of the purse. This might fragment it into two. Have you considered that aspect of it?

ORSINI: Mr. Chairman, I don't think you'd have two legislatures. I think you may have two legislatures if you, for example, took certain legislators and put them into Permanent Fund managers. They would almost be operating a separate legislature. But this is a separate body and this body would still be subject to the law as passed by the legislature and signed by the governor. I would presume that we would have laws of general conceptual of appropriateness to the way in which the Permanent Fund is used and this group would have to operate under those laws.

But still, like any law, whatever executive authority it is has a varying amount of leeway, depending on how tightly those laws are written. I don't think you'd be---you'd have another group just as you have the executive and you have the judiciary and you have the legislative groups now. This would to some extent, with the more narrow confines, I suppose, would be almost a competing group who would have also direct public accountability. But I

don't think you are getting into a separate legislature. A lot of it depends on what the ultimate will of the legislature is with respect to the types of use this Permanent Fund is put to.

Basically, if the legislature decides anything other than maximizing a safe return on the investment, then you are subsidizing some group. It may be homeowners, it may be investing people, it may be fishermen, it may be farmers, it may be any one of a number of groups, whether a narrow constituency or broad statewide groups. It is still some special group or a series of special groups. As opposed to having maximizing returns, having them coming into the general fund for use of legislative determination of how the funding should be spent.

GRUENING: You raised an interesting point there. You were saying that, if I understood it correctly, that when you are dealing with anything but a sole criteria of maximizing income, there is usually some subsidy involved and if you are going to do that there ought to be some equity or some representation.

In other words, if you are going to dole out subsidies, it ought not to be done, let's say, at the decision of some expert, but rather somebody that's responsive as an elected official.

ORSINI: Yes.

GRUENING: Well, let me toss this out as an alternative to that. The extent that you get into the programs which involve subsidies, what do you think of handling it as we do now in the general fund loan programs, in that we establish them out of the general fund, that with the Permanent Fund, you establish that criteria of maximum---of conservation of principal and return the income.

In other words, rather than do everything you have been doing with the general fund, put the Permanent Fund off to the side and say, "OK, we're not---that's the one fund that is not going to be, let's say, doled out, as, say, political pressures dictate, but will be at least for the short run set aside for just preserving capital and producing income." In that way, you don't have that accountability problem that is difficult when you do get into subsidies.

ORSINI: I think I have been on record as personally supporting that concept. Certainly in the short term. As the Permanent Fund grows and as the public becomes more aware of it, you will make a policy at some point. But I think that in the near future it ought to be managed for maximum return, maximum safe return on investment.

GRUENING: Thank you very much. Any other questions?
Thank you, Senator. Our next witness is Robert Rutherford.
Did I pronounce that right?

RUTHERFORD: Yes. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.
Thank you for the opportunity to appear. I'm not exactly---
consider myself very experienced with these things. I hope
I understand the intent of the hearing.

My business, as you may know, is a consulting engineer
working primarily with the electric utilities throughout
Alaska. So, most of my experience in Alaska since I came
here in 1950 has been related primarily to the electric utili-
ties industry. Along the way in working with these utilities,
of course, the business of providing money for the development
of electricity, that unique energy that really contributes
to the quality of life, is one of the things that we are con-
stantly dealing with and I have some thoughts to share with
you and I hope along the way that I can understand the intent
better so that I can add to this with some written testimony
which I can supply later. Will I have the opportunity to sub-
mit some things in writing later?

GRUENING: Yes. And I'd like to say for everyone here
that we'll accept written statements any time until the time

of the session. There are kind of informational booklets the committee has prepared with a questionnaire on the back. Feel free to help yourself to that and, Paul, why don't you take a stack of that so people don't have to come up. Grab them and they can help themselves. Go ahead, sir.

RUTHERFORD: Let me recite a few areas where it's occurred to me that the Permanent Fund or something similar to it, at this point, I'm just trying to understand what some of the concepts for it might be, what the committee might be thinking about it. Let me talk about these briefly. There are several areas where I believe that the use of the Permanent Fund might be valuable to Alaska.

First off, I'll start out with saying that I believe that my understanding of the Permanent Fund that its use should be on a basis where it's returned. In other words, that it is not intended as a gift, that it should be used in a manner that it is returned to the Permanent Fund if it is loaned on various bases. My own personal feelings are that the fund should be used in that manner. So that it does not definitely become part of the system of grants, perhaps.

GRUENING: Incidentally, that's a constitutional requirement,

the way they---it can only fairly be read to preclude grants. It would have to be income producing.

RUTHERFORD: That probably was in my head from back a ways and I'd forgotten it was already a constitutional provision.

One of the areas where I believe the fund could be used, I like to talk about a minute, is perhaps might be considered as marginal in the sense of whether or not it might be a grant, but, let me explain. There are a number of projects that I have seen as potential in Alaska which are the nature of being somewhat unconventional because of the unique requirements of some Alaska situations. So there are some areas where ---I'm speaking of the electric utilities business where the utilities could use some support for projects that engineers such as myself believe are feasible projects and good projects, but at the same time they may be somewhat unconventional and on that account may have some difficulty in obtaining funding from the more usual sources. I'll give you an example or two.

There has been under study by the Alaska Power Administration some ways in which electric energy can be brought to some of the small villages of Alaska on a basis that, perhaps, is a little more reliable and feasible than some of the present

systems that are in use, mainly small individual generating plants scattered around in the various isolated villages. In an effort to evaluate whether there are some alternatives to that, and in particular see if there is some possibility of being able to deliver forms of energy that can displace fossil fuel, the Alaska Power Administration has in this case asked us to do some studies relating to interconnecting villages with transmission lines, or lines of some kind whereby a group could then receive energy from a larger central supply source or perhaps a small hydroelectric project. And of course, as you know, hydroelectric projects are determined by where the water is and where there's the head and invariably it's necessary to take that energy and deliver it. So, in the small village communities, the only alternatives are to figure out a way to interconnect.

There is a concept that I have presented in these reports that is not unique in the world, but it is somewhat unconventional and it's what I've called a "one wire ground return system" of transmitting electricity. It's been used in many parts of the world. The technology is well known. It's not something that's R & D. It is unconventional. There is a small report here that's been prepared suggesting a demonstration project along the Kuskokwim, perhaps centered around Bethel, to interconnect some of the villages that are now supplied primarily by little individual

generating plants. In some cases each home has its own plant. In some of the villages there is a centralized system.

For such a project, I'm convinced that eventually a project of this kind can probably be financed by REA funds, for example. But at the moment its unique characteristics is such that REA says that, well, it isn't exactly according to our specification, our standards. I've had some nice discussions with them, for example, and I can see their engineers believe me. But there's a few hangups that relate to the uniqueness of the system and I'm suggesting that, perhaps through the use of the Permanent Fund and whoever operates it, that some of these unique solutions that may be adaptable to Alaska be given consideration that perhaps some of this fund could be used as a pilot project.

Which I'm saying again is not R & D. It may be unconventional, but I'm convinced would be feasible. You could then produce what you might call a yardstick. That word has been used in other areas to say this is a feasible project. And that means generate additional support from such as REA by saying, "Here's a project that works." This is the way it's doing. We'd like to build a lot more of it.

In the case of REA, the whole philosophy behind it--- their own program is such that, to me, it's a natural to do

this kind of thing. But it does need a little yardstick, something to get it going. Maybe the Permanent Fund, as an Alaskan fund, can help produce a yardstick program that is required for Alaskans because of the unique or unconventional nature of some of the solutions we have to deal with.

Along with this one wire scheme, it just happens also that in the Bethel region there are some interesting records regarding the wind. There is some possibility for the use of wind as power to supplement diesel generation. Because the delivery cost of the fuel, etc., are pretty high, why the cost of energy in those regions are exceedingly high. And even though wind power generation is a very high-cost scheme, basically today, some of the figures we have digested make it look as though it might be useful if it were part of an integrated system where it's not the sole source of energy, but simply used as a supplement to displace higher cost diesel fuel. So the little report suggests the possibility of adding a little wind generation to find out if that is true.

In another area of the supplying power, electrical power, to small villages, you are all acquainted with AVEC, I think most of you know about the Alaska Village Electric Co-op, which is attempting to do the job throughout Alaska, using REA money. Practically all the clients that are in use are diesel clients isolated with

the same problems that I'm talking about here. I think in some cases we can show that interconnection can help that.

But there are some other things that can be done besides the one wire line, for example, and that would be some improvements in the design of diesel electric generating equipment. Here again, there are a number of things that are available in industry. We're not talking about R & D, but we're talking about something that would be a little bit unconventional. Somebody would have to spend a little bit of money to put in the first step.

One of the areas I'm talking about is the operation of diesel electric equipment. One of the big difficulties in these isolated areas in operating the equipment in a reasonably efficient mode and with the electric load bouncing up and down over the daylight, nighttime hours, it's difficult to keep a generating unit running at an efficient load. So, conventional designs of such equipment, having been developed over the years, using the trade-off of fuel cost and other things that generated those designs by the manufacturer, have resulted in designs that are not necessarily adaptable to some of the problems we've got now resulting from high fuel costs and the very isolated nature of some of these systems. Here again, we believe, and there are other engineers who would

go along with this, I'm sure, that there are some modifications of standard generating devices that can be developed, put in a pilot project and shown to be workable. Perhaps that is something that could be done in some other ways too, but I'm using it as an example to say there are some solutions that I believe, as an engineer, are adaptable to Alaska conditions where they might not have been thought about or even useful on the basis of the trade offs in other areas. And perhaps the Alaska fund, Permanent Fund, can look with a different eye on the things that are peculiarly Alaskan in terms of some of the solutions that we need to find.

Getting away from the pilot nature or yardstick nature of projects which the first ones I talked about are, I would suggest some other areas where I believe the Permanent Fund could do some great things for communities of Alaska in energy. And that would be for the fund to participate in some manner with communities in funding for a renewable resource project such as hydroelectric development. I don't have to tell you about hydro---I know that Ernie has been pounding the table for hydroelectric in the communities of Southeastern Alaska for a long time and I'm sure that he would feel that this Permanent Fund could be a tremendous aid to the community to that area. What I'm suggesting is perhaps there is three modes of participation that might be considered.

One of them, of course, would be just a complete funding of a hydroelectric project on a loan basis, long term at appropriate interest rates, lower interest rate, loan to accomplish a hydroelectric project. Through the use of the Water Resources Revolving Fund, which has been operating for a year or two, some communities have been able to get front money to investigate such projects and get them up to the point where it's a go or no-go proposition and then they are faced, of course, with going to the bond market or looking for other sources of funding to actually accomplish the project itself.

And that's where I'm suggesting that the Permanent Fund could participate, either complete funding, perhaps partial funding, and maybe there would be other sources of money, but there would be mutual benefits in lowering interest rates, etc., if the Permanent Fund could participate with a portion of it.

And perhaps the third way would be using the Permanent Fund in a guarantee mode of some kind to guarantee a project rather than using the money directly, backing up a community in the offering of a bond with the guarantee of sorts.

Perhaps I'm influenced to some extent and been sold by the fact that I've been working with REA for a long time, the federal agency. And today they used those three modes for

working with utilities that they finance.

One is a direct loan program, in which, as you know, I'm sure they have two interest rates that are used. They have a certain amount of the money that's loaned out at 2% interest on a 35 year basis and they have some other direct loans they make at 5% interest on 35 year loans.

And they also have a participation program with other lending agencies where they loan part of the money.

And they have guarantee programs.

I'm suggesting that perhaps the Permanent Fund could look to communities for help in energy projects in a similar manner. That there may be something really worth looking at there for the use of that Permanent Fund.

To be a little more particular about renewable resource projects and what it means to Alaska, the hydroelectric development has one thing about it that is---well more than one thing, but---the thing I'm referring to, one thing about it that is quite different than other energy projects and that is that once it's built, its cost, for all practical purposes, do not escalate. And as a practical matter today, we know that almost everything else has been escalating at a pretty substantial rate and most of the economists that make any kind of forecast at all agree generally that escalation is part of the real world and is some-

thing that ought to be considered when you compare alternate projects of one kind or another.

This is one very important difference between the hydroelectric development and alternate energy, electric energy supply systems that you fuel. Because, as we all know sorely, fuel costs certainly have been escalating. And it looks like they're going to continue to escalate because of the fact that we're running out of fuel. Just for the purpose of finding more of it and developing the lesser profitable fuel resources, we know that we are looking at escalation.

On the other hand, the hydroelectric project, once it's built, the sun does the job. It's solar energy, really, and it's free. The falling water is there, it does not escalate. So that obviously there are tremendous benefits to a community when hydroelectric development can take place and displace the fuel they might otherwise have to buy at an escalating rate. And I've made some estimates over a period from now to the year 2000 and the differences are startling if you compare and if you assume some reasonable escalation rate and make a comparison. So, while the support of a project of that kind, I'm suggesting by the Permanent Fund, would be on a loan basis, you'd get your money back like any other loan, it would have a tremendous spinoff on the community itself and obviously

the state in terms of number one, electric cost to the community, number two, stretching the fossil fuel resource because it displaces what would otherwise have to be consumed in the fossil resource.

Another area that the Permanent Fund might find use, and this one is perhaps a little more way out, pardon the expression, I think it is real however and there may be some opportunities for the Permanent Fund to be used this way and that would have to do with some more major developments of energy systems in Alaska. Such as, the support, perhaps through the use of guarantees, I'm not suggesting direct loans in this case, but that it could be very influential in the feasibility of such projects. A major project such as a generation of transmission system for Central Alaska which would extend from Anchorage to Prudhoe Bay. As come of you may know, I've suggested electrification of the gas line and oil line route. I believe that it's feasible because the energy displaced by such electrification has a pretty fancy value today. And if you look at the value of the energy you displace, that would otherwise be burned in the simple transportation of the energy through Alaska, you can show that the electric isolators, that the electric generation would be feasible just from an economic point of view. And of course it would again substantially impact those fuels which---the ones I'm talking about now are oil and gas.

Now where do you get the electricity to do this? Well, there's other fossil resources such as coal. I believe that coal fired electric energy can probably be feasible to displace oil and gas. Coal at the present time---and I'm thinking about fuel is at a lower priority than gas and oil---and so it might be useful to displace that oil and gas.

Obviously, hydroelectric energy could certainly be used to do the job. It does also appear along the way, though, that the hydroelectric project that we are looking at today in this region---which in this case would be like a Susitna development---that most of that hydroelectric energy can actually be absorbed for other purposes in Alaska. It can be used by the community for their normal load growth of Anchorage and Fairbanks and the Central area. I'm suggesting that, if projects such as this catch on in any sense, that perhaps the Permanent Fund can be helpful in improving the feasibility of such a project.

A similar project could be accomplished in Southeastern Alaska. And this is one of the concepts which was talked about many, many years ago by the Forest Service when they made their little study of the water power of Southeastern Alaska. They suggested the possibility of an energy intertie throughout the whole of Southeastern Alaska through the use of sub-

marine cables in many cases because of the rugged nature of the country. And I'm saying now, that while this concept may be slightly way out, there are developments happening in Alaska which very likely may bring such a suggestion to the fore again. But because of the Alaska conditions that exist, it's going to take horsepower to make it go and that Permanent Fund is certainly---it's going to be a device that would impact projects of that nature.

And I'm simply saying that I believe those projects are likely to show feasibility as reviewed by Alaskans. We Alaskans do have some difficulty communicating with other parts of the financial world on some of the things that are unique to Alaska. And this is an area where I believe the Permanent Fund, using good judgement ---I'm not saying do anything silly---but because there will be Alaskans involved, they're probably in a better position to evaluate the kinds of things that I've been talking about in Alaska terms and arrive at a conclusion that says it's a good deal where the general financial market that we usually look to might not be able to evaluate it that same way and thereby something might go begging that really is a good project. The Permanent Fund, to me, would seem like it could perform a valuable function in supporting some of those concepts when they develop.

I guess that's about it and I'd be---I'm intending to put a little more of this in writing and perhaps you can tell me what

portions you feel at this point in your hearing would be appropriate related to the Permanent Fund. I haven't been at any of the other hearings so I don't have the benefit of that.

GRUENING: Well, thank you very much for your interesting comprehensive statement of the possibilities of Permanent Fund participation in energy development. I think we'd like very much to have your written statement. You might include in it some of the reasons REA funding isn't possible for these projects and any more specifics you have on how the financing might work.

RUTHERFORD: Yes, I have some of that and I can do that.

GRUENING: Are there questions from the committee for Mr. Rutherford?

HAUGEN: Well, I could ask a lot of questions but I think it would be a repetition of what he said.

Principally, what you're saying is that maintaining the idea that the Permanent Fund principal will remain but, if those projects could be financed on a long term, low interest basis, the state would get its money back, it would be just

the thing in the early period that---we're using hydro only as an example---the early costs are the ones that put most of us---I'm talking about Wrangell, Petersburg area---out of business if we could have that money loaned to us on a long term, low interest basis say at an early cost of 3 or 4% for the first ten years, knowing how the state fund managers in other funds operate, they want, of course, to obtain the maximum yield.

But, farther down the road, when these utilities got on their feet, they could probably have an accelerated rate of interest. They jump it from 4% to 5% and 5% to 5½% and that of course depends on the size of the project to take. My idea was to have one that had 30 or 40 years of life which, even if we ration it out on a 6% annual growth rate, the state would still get a good return on its money in the long run.

I'm not talking about any giveaway projects, I'm talking about good projects. That if they could get this foot off of the ground and the state would get its money back, we'd retain the idea of what the Permanent Fund is. It would do all kinds of things. It would save the consumer. It would maintain the interest of the consumer down the road if we're going to displace these Mickey Mouse projects we've got now with diesel power. It's just the peaking load---you're acquainted with our problem in Petersburg that throws the rate schedule out to the point that you never

get out of the woods as far as debts are---in fact the peak-
ing power costs you more than the primary power. I appreciate
the comments that you've made to the committee and it's along
the lines I've been thinking. I look forward to some more
of it.

RUTHERFORD: Well, I say again that I believe that the
Permanent Fund can perform a unique function and I know there's
lots of ideas for the use of the Permanent Fund, so whoever
manages that fund has got a problem of spreading it around
the state in a fair and best manner---for the best interests
of the whole state.

But, when you look at the communities themselves in
general and potential spinoffs, I think the energy area is
one place where the use of that fund can result in benefits
that will spread throughout most of the population of the
state. There are particular problems related to Alaskans
and now Alaska is going to have a particular fund that's
also Alaska's. And I'm just suggesting that right there we
have an opportunity to do some of the things, that we have
a little difficulty convincing the rest of the world, that
are feasible. Through the use of the Permanent Fund, I be-
lieve you can yardstick some stuff so we can get some more

money in besides. And since the Permanent Fund can perhaps be used to really generate additional spinoffs to a lot of the communities.

GRUENING: Any questions? Thank you very much.

RUTHERFORD: Thank you.

GRUENING: Our next witness is Carl Steeby.

STEEBY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to be here, appear here. I do not have an entire text or anything, but I would like to offer some of my thoughts to the committee on the Permanent Fund.

I have asked quite a number of people the question what's the purpose of the Permanent Fund to see what their thoughts were when this Permanent Fund was set up and, needless to say, I received numerous answers, mostly to curb legislative spending, to help all Alaskans, to have some money left when the oil runs out and a few had the same opinion I did when the Permanent Fund was set up. It was to mainly develop renewable resources from the income of non-renewable resources, whether it be oil, gas, minerals, whatever they might be.

I was at the hearings Saturday over at the Anchorage Westward and listened to Dr. Gordon and Dr. Bergman make their presentations and, really, I couldn't agree with either one of them and their thoughts on the Permanent Fund. Dr. Bergman split her ideas straight down three different ways. She had three scenarios, you may remember. One was spend it as you get it. The other was the gilt-edge investment. The third was a development fund.

I don't subscribe to any of these scenarios, per se. I subscribe more to all of them. Not necessarily spend it as you get it. Maybe spend the income that would go to the general fund for things like parks, recreation, campgrounds, pioneer roads to the attractions and so forth.

There was several mentions of the \$900 million that disappeared. I might say that, for personal reasons, I had to leave the state from 1963 to 1973. I first came to Alaska in 1942 and have been here most of the time since and in 1963 our roads were in a terrible mess. You couldn't find a campground anywhere, you couldn't find any rest areas, you had to go by the nearest tree or anything else. When I came back in '73 we had campgrounds like no other state has that I know of. They're everywhere, there's lots of them, we need more. They're crowded. But, a lot of that \$900 million did some

good. It wasn't all rat holed as Dr. Gordon said.

On the second scenario of Dr. Bergman, I believe that we should have a portion of the Permanent Fund go into gilt-edged investments. These would be long term, high interest bearing investments that would go into our general fund, the income, and reduce some of our taxes. Everybody all over the state--- the Permanent Fund is supposed to help everybody and I think that we could reduce our taxes from the income a certain percent. I'm not offering any suggestions of what percent of the Permanent Fund should be used in gilt-edged investments. I think that would be for somebody that knows a little more about economics.

Thirdly, the development scenario, which I subscribe to wholeheartedly, is long term, low interest loans or participation loans or guarantee loans as Mr. Rutherford pointed out.

And I might say that I am an engineer with Robert W. Rutherford Associates, so I---however there is no collusion. We haven't talked together or anything. We didn't even have time to prepare a text.

But these three different methods of financing projects should be considered. Again, no giveaway program---it has to be returned to the state. And in the development, I think that we should consider first our renewable resources for these funds.

The world is going hungry now for protein. We have a lot of bottom fish. Somebody is going to develop the bottom fishery.

Who is going to do it? We need more canneries. We were flying fish to British Columbia, to the lower 48. They were telling me the other day they lost a planeload of fish flying them from Yakutat to Anchorage. We need more cold storage plants. Timber Resources. A lot of the smaller communities could develop small shingle mills, veneer plants, finished lumber. Who's going to do it? Are we going to do it or are we going to let the Japanese come in here and do it---take all of our lumber, our bottom fisheries, build our canneries. Or are we going to do it ourselves?

And, another renewable resource that goes to my heart is the hydroelectric development and I would like to say right along with the hydroelectric development, fish hatcheries. You may wonder why I combine these two, but I have worked from Kotzebue to Ketchikan and this past summer I have lived in nearly every community in Southeastern Alaska from Yakutat to Metlakatla many times. And although they had an excellent fish run this year it was a very dry year in Southeastern Alaska. There were a lot of smaller streams where the salmon were dying in the mouth of the stream because there wasn't enough water to get up to spawn. And I'm wondering what it's going to be

3 or 4 years from now when those fish that would have spawned normally came back.

In Petersburg, there is a hydroelectric plant. The water from the tailrace is utilized in the state fish hatchery. If it had not been from the Petersburg hydroelectric plant, they would not have had enough water to operate the fish hatchery. Also, fry from the fish hatchery was put into streams where the salmon could not get into spawn. So, in my way of thinking, we can build hydroelectric plants and fish hatcheries at the same time and we can go Mother Nature one better. We can do a lot of things to enhance the fisheries as well as develop hydroelectric power.

At the present time in Southeastern Alaska, the average fuel costs per kilowatt hour of energy generated is running a little over 4¢ a kilowatt hour. Nearly all the smaller communities are using diesel electric, while the largest communities are using diesel because of the front-end money. It's hard for a community of, say, a thousand people to go to the market and say we would like to borrow \$8 million to build a hydroelectric plant. Well, that's kind of unreasonable for a banker to say here's a thousand people that's come in here and wants to borrow \$8 million. They're out of their, way out of their league. Personally, I start pulling my hair out when I get my electric bill and I'm paying about 2¢ a kilowatt hour for it delivered to

my home.

And these people are paying over 4¢ now just for fuel. And in 1995 they're going to be paying over 13¢ a kilowatt hour for diesel fuel. I maintain that if you can build hydroelectric plants at fuel replacement costs at the time it comes on the line, it should be built. And I would like to have the committee really dwell on this development portion of the scenarios that Dr. Bergman set forth. And I think we can use some of the income, say, from the low interest we get on our development programs or the high interest from our gilt-edged investments to even build a few amenities for Dr. Gordon, but I would say more in convention centers and that sort of thing and not opera houses and golf courses. Thank you.

GRUENING: Thank you. Were there any questions from the committee? I just have one. My brief experience with looking at hydroelectric projects, at least explained on paper, is that they are expensive. If we're talking about a \$2 billion fund and we consider all the uses that people want the fund to accomplish---like in Fairbanks it's everything from artifacts to whales, literally, yesterday.

Buy, hydro wasn't mentioned, but I know in other regions

of the state it's probably more feasible and it's popular. But, how many projects do you think the fund could get involved in and still accomplish some of the others here. You see a limitation in terms of the number of hydro projects that the fund can get involved in.

STEEBY: Yes, that's why I brought up the three different types of financing. Possibly if you had finance money, there wasn't a demand for it, you could go in and make a complete loan package for a hydroelectric development. Now, I'm talking more---the smaller outlying villages, Dillingham, Kodiak, Petersburg, Metlakatla, Hydaburg, Klawack, where ever. More so I think than I would in actual development of Sitka.

Like I was preparing the energy cost. The rail belt area along the pipeline I feel has benefited economically from the oil and gas business. This same economic enhancement in this area has made a hardship for the rest of Alaska by increasing the wages, the prices of fuel, one thing and another that people have to pay. It has done nothing to increase the price of fish or how much a cant of lumber or something like that is going to bring in. But, still they're paying the higher prices and one thing and another. It hurts them and it is more or less, I think, helps the Anchorage-Fairbanks area.

And to make it a more equitable thing, I think the fund should be spread out and not one huge hydroelectric plant for one specific area of the state, unless there is the money available. But, if you have a limited amount of money, I would say participation. Pay a project off, a small project, say in Petersburg, maybe \$8-\$10 million. Maybe you can say well, we'll loan you \$3 million; we'll guarantee \$6 million; we'll guarantee the loan. You find the money someplace else, but we'll guarantee it. And with that guarantee, they could get a whole lot lower interest rate from somebody else. I mean, it depends on how much money you have available for the different projects and it would be a matter of allotting the money throughout the state.

GRUENING: Thank you. Are there any further questions from the committee? Thank you, Mr. Steeby. Our next witness is Peter Van Dilla, if he's still here. OK, Betzi Woodman.

WOODMAN: I have mine written up because if I were to just talk, I would spend all the rest of your hearing time because of---this subject has such broad interests. I'm not an expert in investment and management things and I won't address myself to that particular of it, except to suggest

to the committee that there be an investigation of the state bank concept, that is, and the Dakota is not going to like this, but I don't know whether it's North or South Dakota, has it. I know a little bit about it. But, I do have a statement and I'll read it for you. First I'll identify myself.

My name is Betzi Woodman and my profession is writer. I first met Alaska in 1953 when my husband was assigned here with the Air Force. We extended his two-year tour because we had fallen in love with the place. After a brief hiatus in California where he decided to retire from the Air Force after 20 years service, my husband and I came back to make our home here in 1959. Since then, our three children and their children also live here so we have a broad stake in this, our adopted home. I have been involved in numerous volunteer activities over the years and, after writing for both newspapers in Anchorage, I chose at the end of 1963 to become a freelance writer, which profession I still follow. The work has taken me around the state often and brought me in contact with many people. Much of what I present here has been discussed with several of these persons who concur with my thinking.

You will be besieged by suggestions on where to invest the Permanent Fund, how to spend its income. Choosing among these suggestions will be a most demanding job and I hope that you can maintain your thoughtful approach and not succumb to impulse or sudden pressure of a particularly vocal group.

When the state received the then-unprecedented \$900 million in oil and gas lease bonuses in 1969, the last Gene Guess convened a series of seminars to get public opinion on how to use the riches. He invited a group of Alaskans from all regions and representing a broad cross section of interests in the state to meet with a faculty from the Brookings Institution. I was privileged to be an editor for the series and helped to record and summarize the final report of what the people wanted.

It was noteworthy that with one exception, everyone who came, no matter how regional his prior feelings, soon put regionalism aside and truly addressed the subject of what was best for Alaska and its people as a whole. The specifics are on record, but the overall finding showed that it did not matter how much money the state had---a lot or a little---the desires would be the same: to maintain that peculiar quality of life and to enhance it.

Brainstorming sessions revealed that defining quality of life was a bit more complicated. Each related to his or her particular experiences, attitudes and life style. Basically however, accomplishing this goal would include these things:

Protection of environmental values.

Conserve non-renewable resources.

Develop renewable resources, particularly fisheries.

Provide educational opportunities which fit the people's needs and desires.

Encourage cultural development.

Support the strong, independent character of Alaskans.

It was suggested in the discussions that Alaska could skip certain historic phases of development---such as industrial---and could find innovative approaches to economic questions, although few specific programs were presented by the faculty.

At the same time the Brookings' findings were making their impact, a new phrase was heard throughout the land: Alaskans have the last chance to do it differently, to profit from mistakes made in the South 48.

The phrase was used most often by those from the lower states as they addressed various publics on such matters as Building the Pipeline. (That's capital letters.)

Soon it will be a decade since those first "riches." How and where that money was spent is not the issue here. But attitudes of people, particularly leaders, and how they've approached the ideals are very much the issue. They, too, can be and often are greedy, shortsighted, impulsive, unwilling to consider all the options. They find it difficult to live up to their own statements of how to achieve a better society.

But perhaps this time the leadership---you, in fact--- can

help guide the people toward fulfilling lives. You will certainly be asked to help make life a little easier for Alaskans, and that, if done with wisdom, is a valid consideration. But I fervently hope that totally cutting out various taxes which support our necessary institutions and government functions will not be the way you ease their lives.

The evidence is everywhere that when people do not pay their own way, when they are unaware of costs for services, when they have no grasp of what it took to make or build something, when they put little value on the "somethings" which come with no effort and that they also lose in strength and character.

On top of that, if costs of living are reduced too greatly in Alaska, it will open the flood gates for all the freeloaders who want only to be in on the "freebies" but not to contribute to the growth and stability of the state.

And finally, I would ask that you look to ways of enhancing what we have rather than getting more or of setting up the machinery which would lead to the "more and more" syndrome.

So, with that for background, here is my specific suggestion:

Establish a percentage of the income from the Permanent

Fund to be available on an annual basis to Alaskan communities for use in connection with cultural facilities.

GRUENING: Would you say that again, please.

WOODMAN: Establish a percentage of the income from the Permanent Fund to be available on an annual basis to Alaskan communities for use in connection with cultural facilities.

A formula would be developed for communities according to population and could be weighted in a manner to be more helpful to those communities with less economic viability.

The funds would be available on application and would not require matching in kind or money. A community would have to demonstrate fiscal responsibility in use of the funds and show that a cultural facility (as defined later here) actually exists or is actively being planned.

There would be no "strings" on how the money was used for the facility. That is, the only "approval" of use would be to show that the money would be used for some aspect such as: design for a new facility or complex; contribution to actual construction of such, maintenance or programming for the facility or addition of a wing, etc.; acquisition of art works or museum material; salary for a curator or a director; assistance in re-

tiring a debt on an existing facility; furnishings for such a facility---new or to upgrade; sponsorship of a program recognized as valid for the type of facility, for example, instructor in management of such an institution, artist in residence, special performance assistance to outside group, etc. These could be specified or it could be shown what would NOT be allowed.

The facility would have to be truly representative of public interest.

To define a cultural facility: It is defined as a facility or complex which has its principal function serving the arts activities of the community through theatre, concert hall, museum, and/or gallery; with additional compatible uses such as conventions, community meetings and library services as determined by each community.

The money could be allocated through the offices of, for example, the State Council on the Arts, and its member local arts councils---always keeping in mind that the local interests get true representation. The object would not be to add another layer of government, but to safeguard allocations so that communities would indeed have local authority and the projects be valid.

The percentage of the Permanent Fund thus allocated could be invested in a separate account, thus earning and enlarging while applications were pending.

Penalties could be established for misuse of funds. An annual application date would have to be determined for such applications and grants so that the amount available could be related to requests.

There is extensive justification why this is an important consideration. A 1975 report found that 93 percent of the adult American population felt that cultural activities and facilities were important to their lives, and the growth of the arts has reflected this appreciation.

A professor interested in views on art of the average working person talked with 400 blue collar workers---maids, clerks, mechanics, bus and truck drivers, cab drivers, secretaries, hotel desk clerks, waitresses, carpenters and street laborers as they went about their daily tasks. Their opinions were written up in the study, Opinions of Working People Concerning Art. Some critics hailed it as the first "tell it like it is" audience "pulse feeler" done in a long time.

Generally, the professor said, workers interviewed believed that art is necessary to the enjoyment, fulfillment and pleasure of living. A majority also think that tax money should be used to fund artists and art projects. And this is a quote from the report. "We found that contrary to the general belief, they (man and woman on the streets) like art, enjoy it, feel it worth-

while, know much more than we (the arts world) give them credit for . . . and of course, we discovered what we should have known all along: that most of them dabble in it themselves, as Sunday painters or collectors of everything from antiques to Ming vases, and coins, stamps---that they act in neighborhood groups, sing in choruses and quartets or save their money for tickets for special performances of plays, operas, ballets--which appeals to them."

As a bartender told one interviewer: "Art brings most of us closer to what we really are and what we feel."

A similar survey done in the Anchorage borough three years ago revealed the same points of view and willingness to help support arts projects.

The preamble to the bylaws of an eleven-community Cultural Facilities Development Committee---and I believe you are aware of it through some appropriations to the Southeast Regional Arts Council, or beginnings of it, and I can tell you the names of the communities involved in this at present, are Dillingham, Naknek, Anchorage, Haines, Skagway, Juneau, Sitka, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Hoonah and Petersburg. And I'm on the executive board of that committee.

Now then, where was I? The preamble of that committee reads, "We who are involved in the arts know the importance of cultural facilities to the life of a community. We also

know how stifling the lack of such facilities can be to cultural growth. Our task will be to make the voters of the state aware of what cultural facilities can contribute to our communities. Cultural centers can become the focal point for a variety of community activities, (and can answer the question of young people--- what is there to do), providing entertainment, cultural enrichment, recreation, instruction and social opportunity for all the people in the community as well as for those who visit our villages and cities.

"Along with Alaska's rapid economic development, there is a growing awareness of Alaska's renewable human resources. Civilizations are remembered for their lasting contributions to the arts, artists and Alaska's ever-growing arts audience, these centers proposed for Alaska will contribute to such an endowment." That's the end of the preamble.

If ever there were something which would contribute to and enhance the quality of life in Alaska, participation in creative endeavors is it. And having a facility where it can happen, a situation usually beyond the capabilities of any but the wealthiest cities, would be the catalyst.

We can do it differently in Alaska and this is one exciting, beautiful way. And we do care how they do it Outside because that's where we learn, both what to do and what not to do. Thank you.

GRUENING: Thank you very much. I appreciated the philosophical bent of your statement. What we are really asking today, not the technical aspect. Someone said in Fairbanks yesterday, we can hire a mechanic to fix our car, but we don't ask the mechanic where we want to drive it. And I appreciated your point of view. Are there any questions? Bill?

MILES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciate your outstanding presentation. Betzi, while you were putting your presentation together, did you at any time at all wrestle with the problem of the income producing limitations under which we are restrained?

WOODMAN: Say it again, please.

MILES: Insofar as the Permanent Fund, we're somewhat limited to income producing...

GRUENING: She mentioned dedication of the income for this purpose.

WOODMAN: Yes. Not the main fund, but a specific percentage which---and I wouldn't think that it would be our

responsibility to figure out the formula when the management group is there just so it could be done. But it would go on in the community, you know, forever.

MILES: Thank you.

GRUENING: Representative Meekins.

MEEKINS: Mrs. Woodman, one of the questions that keeps coming up, and I think it's a good one, is why would a certain proposal be more appropriate or better accomplished through the use of the Permanent Fund than through the general fund or some of the other funding mechanisms available to the state?

The reason I think that's a good question is because I'm assuming that people voted for the fund in order to circumvent the normal funding mechanism which is through the general fund. And if we were to fund all of the needs that have been demonstrated or even the good ideas that have been demonstrated to us in just a couple of days of hearings, I think we'd end up with something very similar to the general fund, because there are, of course, a great many needs in the state and we try to address them through the normal budget process.

So, it's becoming clear to me that, or at least I'm starting to think that the Permanent Fund being used for activities that

are more appropriate to it than to the general fund and I'm wondering if you had any chance to think in those terms at all.

WOODMAN: I suppose I'd go in terms of what our experience has been in trying to get such things from the general fund. The demand for very basic economic related things has been so intense that it is very difficult to address to this. And it's kind of too bad always to have this one left over thing when I have a feeling that this---I've lived long enough and been experienced enough to realize that this kind of thing is more important than an awful lot of other things.

We use the phrase, as you know, that we don't live by bread alone, and we say it very glibly. But, the great deal of investigation into the internals of how people think and how they live---the young people's protests have been to discover that they really don't answer their needs. They are not the same.

I had the opportunity to gather a great deal of information from people who participated in "Cry of the Wild Ram" over the years at Kodiak. And this was an amazing thing. What it meant to individuals to be part of this. It had nothing to do with who came, who saw, who benefited as an audience. It had to do with the person relating to other

people. A sense of creativity, a sense of belonging, a sense of history of their area which they gained. And they were very emotional about it. They felt it had given a direction to their lives. And, you know, not everyone has ski boots or can afford them and not everybody wants to go down the mountain and not everybody can play in an orchestra. But in a cultural facility, there is a place for anybody who wants to be there. And the responsibility of course is on the community to generate how it's used. And in Naknek, the museum and saving of their artifacts seems to be their major need now. This might change over the years. In some of the larger urban areas, the dramatic presentations and the music presentations become more important.

But, I've taught school over the years. I've taught music and I've worked in theatre and so on. And it's my experience that over and over again it has been the saving thing to many a person because he found a place where he belongs and it's important to him. His community is the life.

MEEKINS: I think you make a very compelling argument for the need for these types of things in our lives. But, I guess, what you are saying because historically, you don't feel that it has been funded enough or quickly enough, or something, through the general fund, and since the Permanent Fund would allow us to, in essence, dedicate a certain percentage year after year and you

wouldn't have to continually make presentations and try to get them from the state since it would be a dedicated fund, that that would be a more secure way of funding it and that's the reason you look to the Permanent Fund, then?

WOODMAN: I think so, yes.

MEEKINS: Thank you.

GRUENING: Any further questions? Thank you very much.

STEEBY: I'd like to comment on the question there.

GRUENING: OK, well normally---we'll go out of order---we don't like to do that---as long as we don't get involved in a debate. Go ahead.

STEEBY: Her ideas are quite a bit like mine on using the income from the Permanent Fund for recreation facilities, campgrounds, art galleries, medical centers and things. I think we're going to have to keep our taxes up to keep all of the freeloaders from coming in and, rather than take income from the Permanent Fund and put it into the general fund to maybe reduce our taxes too low, designate some of

this money for some of the more social aspects of our living. Rather than just having it all go into the general fund.

GRUENING: I guess your only disagreement is on opera, right?

Thank you very much. I think we have time for the last listed witness, Harold Pomeroy, and then at that point I think we'll break for lunch and then it's a free-for-all. The way we did it in Fairbanks is anyone who wanted to testify next just came up and the first one to get here got it. Everyone was very gentlemenly about it.

POMEROY: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I was plagued in attempting to prepare testimony because it seemed to me that I didn't have anything to say that you didn't already know and I'm not a specialist or a professional in a particular field of finance. I was uncertain as to how to proceed and be useful. I decided to take a look at your preliminary report by the House Special Committee, that it might aid you a little bit in your further deliberations. I also thought that I could be most useful, if useful at all, by proceeding from my own experiences in the field in Alaska and make reference to them. I have prepared my testimony, you have copies of it. I think it well to read through it so that if there are any questions...

The work of your committee merits high marks. It is clear that you are laying out as many pertinent facts and as much useful information as feasible. The preliminary report by your committee on the Alaska Permanent Fund is evidence of the quality of your efforts.

The report is a good start. The issues and considerations bearing on the Permanent Fund are so complex and extraordinary, however, that enough data from which to draw well-considered conclusions will tend to make any report for general distribution overly long. This is a handicap.

And I interject there that we are possessed of a great many illusions, a great many hopes and aspirations that are just that. For example, recently the urban conservatory conducted an attitudinal study in the lower end of the Kenai Peninsula and contacted more than half the families there. And, in asking about what the people would like to see developed, what they'd like to see evolved, 92% of them said the emphasis should be on agriculture. Well, agriculture started on the Kenai Peninsula in 1949 and it is negligible now. And however a person might feel emotionally about agriculture versus industrialization, for example, there is a large part of illusion there as there is in some of our other hopes and aspirations.

Such qualifications as I may have to appear before you

on the Permanent Fund come mostly from actual experiences.

My first contact with Alaska was in 1948 when I flew here from Vienna, Austria, to take a look. In addition to personal interest, there was also the purpose to do off-the-record reconnaissance for groups representing war weary Europeans looking for a fresh start by resettlement. General Kepner provided me with a C-46 to fly around the Kenai Peninsula, Matanuska Valley and Susitna area for an entire day. When I returned and talked with John Gorsuch, then president of the Chamber of Commerce, and queried others, it seemed to me the potentials for economically sound large scale settlement, and particularly with reference to an agricultural industry, would be too meager to be feasible. It looked as though importing tens of thousands or twenty thousand or thirty thousand people would be an extravagantly expensive and hazardous effort in the absence of conditions more favorable to viability. Perhaps my original interest had been stimulated a little bit by a statement by Interior Secretary Hickey's in the 1930s that Alaska's future would rest on very large scale settlements of people, that is to build up population.

I was raised in alfalfa ranching and dairying in Los Angeles County and after six wearying years in Europe during and after the Second World War, the peace of Alaska as seen in 1948 was so appealing that we homesteaded at Bear Cove on the Kenai Peninsula in 1949. We sawed lumber for fishermen around Kechemak Bay,

operated hothouses and commercial gardens. We would have enjoyed this life a little longer had there been very low interest capital investment money, but this would still not have produced enough efficiency to be commercially competitive. We saw and knew scores of once-hopeful homesteader-farmers on the Kenai Peninsula who are now gone. And I know of one viable farm on the Kenai Peninsula and there maybe a few more, but it is negligible.

In 1965 the executive director of the Tolstoy Foundation, the world-wide White Russian refugee service organization, asked for a conference on behalf of peasant Russian emigrees from Siberia who had arrived in the U.S. via China and Argentina and wanted to establish themselves on the Kenai Peninsula in a village where they could retain a simple lifestyle. We aided them, working with Roscoe Bell of the state division of lands to arrange a sale of land and leases.

The Russians were enthusiastic about agriculture and they were peasants. But we cautioned that they should be ready to do anything as agriculture might be too meager. They are now hardworking, successful fishermen. Initially they were prepared to be hardworking farmers but found the potentials just too limited.

They have been self supporting from the outset and now