

ment efforts if we are to achieve any results? As in Los Angeles, for example, action in air pollution is frequently taken without consulting the sanitation control districts, without consulting the regional planning agencies, and almost always results in putting additional burdens on these other bodies as well as on local government and on private citizens. This is not the proper way to get results or to solve the problem in this area.

Mr. DADDARIO. That comes under the heading of better management that you touched on.

Mr. RAYNES. Yes, I think it would be preferable if they could do it locally. But, if the local agencies won't do it, yet the people want it done, I think there is only one way it can be done.

Mr. BROWN. The Federal way.

Mr. RAYNES. Some Federal way.

Mr. BROWN. I wish I could agree with you on that, but I almost am forced to the conclusion that if the problem is not being solved and can't be solved locally in a metropolitan region with 10 million people in it, a population which is greater than a large number of countries in the world, that all the Federal Government can do by direct action is probably to make the problem worse.

Now, maybe I'm pessimistic about this, but it seems to me that the step for the Federal Government to take and the role that it should exercise is that of compelling the local organization to rationalize itself so that it can solve the problem there. In Los Angeles we shouldn't have to send to Washington for experts. We have the experts in Los Angeles. Nevertheless we frequently end up going to Washington for them just because we aren't organized to take advantage of what we have in Los Angeles.

Mr. RAYNES. That's the management end. You are now talking about a political problem which is outside of my sphere and in yours.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Brown does put the problem in the proper perspective.

Mr. RAYNES. He certainly does.

Mr. DADDARIO. You are talking about a group of 10 million people with a problem that affects them personally. They certainly ought to be more concerned about it than the Federal Government. It is hard to argue with your logic, Mr. Brown.

Mr. Vivian?

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Raynes, I have about six points to cover here.

I'll start off by saying that I hope that the Federal role in controlling pollution can be a strong and effective one. I have voted that way, but would not suggest that one be too hopeful. For example, we depend upon the voter for authority and that same voter doesn't wish to have costs imposed upon him by local property taxes and other taxes. It's a question of when he should take out his anger and on what level. I think this is classically illustrated in the bill before us in Congress this week. We have a bill before us to establish civil rights in certain areas, one of which is housing. When the bill was first written, it was more rigid than the existing legislation in my own municipality.

At the first amendment, it became less rigid, and less effective than the bill of my own municipality. I will predict that before it is passed