

Although we agree with the basic intent of H.R. 6981, we do not feel it's workable legislation because of the time element Mr. Chairman. I would like to submit my statement for the record but be accorded the privilege of addressing a few remarks to HR 12232 if I may, and just try to be as short as I can.

Mr. MULTER. Certainly your statement will be made part of the record at this point.

(The prepared statement follows.)

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. McGRATH, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF FUELS RESEARCH COUNCIL, AUGUST 10, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is John A. McGrath. I am Executive Vice President of Fuels Research Council, Inc., with offices at 1130 17th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. Fuels Research Council is an affiliate of the National Coal Association. As an affiliate of NCA, it speaks for the principal commercial coal producers and sales companies of the nation. In addition several of the major coal hauling railroads are members of Fuels Research.

Although we in the coal industry agree with the basic intent of H.R. 6981, we do not feel it is workable legislation. We do believe, however, that a single Air Pollution Control Agency or Board should be established in the District of Columbia. We believe that this agency or board should be empowered to establish and enforce rules and regulations.

Section 5. directs the Commissioners to conduct studies and develop plans for prevention or abatement of air pollution. This is not a job for the Commissioners. They are already heavily burdened with the everyday problems of the District. In addition, they may not be sufficiently technically oriented to pass on regulations dealing with such a complex problem as air pollution, its abatement and control.

It is, we suggest, far better to set up a Board or Agency comprised of people knowledgeable in the field of air pollution. This Board or Agency should, as stated earlier, have the authority to adopt rules and regulations and the power to enforce them. However, interested parties should be accorded a hearing before regulations are promulgated with of course the opportunity afforded aggrieved parties to seek relief in the courts as Section 16 of H.R. 6981 provides.

Because of the many complex factors which must be considered in seeking to improve air quality, it would be most appropriate to have a technical advisory committee to the Board composed of qualified representatives of the public, government and business.

In authorizing any regulation, it is wise to know existing conditions, whether a problem exists, and if so, its dimensions. The Public Health Service is presently conducting a study which it hopes to conclude this fall to try to determine the pollutants in the ambient air, the air we all breathe in the District of Columbia, and their sources.

After this has been determined, the Board could then go forward with proper steps to regulate air pollution in the District. In striving to achieve desired goals of improved air quality it is essential that the regulations be economically and technically feasible. It is therefore essential that a technical advisory committee be established so that the Air Pollution Board or Agency will have at its disposal consensus of opinion from people knowledgeable in all aspects of air pollution.

We have reviewed Senate Bill S. 1941 introduced on June 13, 1967 by Mr. Tydings of Maryland for himself, Mr. Morse and Mr. Spong and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. This is the type of legislation which should be enacted. S. 1941 adopts the concept of establishing an Air Pollution Board and an Advisory Committee much along the lines we have outlined above. We respectfully recommend that similar legislation be introduced in the House since we are firmly convinced that the establishment of an Air Pollution Board with strong powers and duties is the best way to cope with control over our environment.

As you know better than I, it is unwise to write specific regulations into law, the better practice is to authorize regulations which can be altered as required to meet changing needs and new technology. Therefore we oppose embedding into law specific regulatory limitations on alleged air pollutants or potential air pollution sources as H.R. 6981 does in its sections 6 through 15. For example,