

disaster, supplies to combat the pollution were not readily available, and local Coast Guard authorities were forced to take charge on an ad hoc basis, with any guidance.

For example, Mr. Chairman, when I visited down there as did Mr. Howard of your committee, and I asked at a meeting which had been assembled for the purpose of discussing this problem, I said "Well, who is in charge?" And the Captain of the Coast Guard said, "Well, I guess I am." And he said that only after some thought.

TIME TO ENACT AN EFFECTIVE LAW

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 15906, and I respectfully urge the adoption of the two amendments which I have outlined. It is time that the Congress enact a truly effective antipollution law, and it is essential to give this needed protection to coastal communities whose valuable and irreplaceable coastal resources are in constant danger of serious pollution damage.

Mr. Chairman, the various agencies of our government have been studying this at least since the *Torrey Canyon* disaster, studying it vigorously and perhaps at times very feverishly, to develop standard operating procedures for dealing with such disaster. We need to assign responsibility, we need to find techniques and procedures, and we need to get the kinds of equipment that can deal with these problems.

But as in many areas of Federal activity, when the last emergency occurred, that of the Puerto Rico, little evidence was offered that any progress had been made.

I mentioned in my prepared statement the Coast Guard's lack of real knowledge as to who was in charge.

We must understand the problem. There is an inadequate standard operating procedure in existence at any echelon of government not paying attention to the needs, as I pointed out in my report when I returned from the *Torrey Canyon* disaster, for sealanes and for shore guidance systems. They are still in the trial and error stage on techniques.

When we got down there to Puerto Rico, as Mr. Howard will tell you, they were experimenting on the scene, experiments which should have taken place in the interim since the *Torrey Canyon* disaster. And they did not even have a good supply of nontoxic detergents available.

Now, I noted in a statement furnished me by the American Petroleum Institute that they have announced their support of legislation attempting to deal with this. But their statement, although it is good, is negative in nature. They have in fact initiated a clean seas program. But in spite of this, the incidence of shoreline pollution has increased.

In their statement, they emphasize their interest in protecting themselves from the damages that could be assessed. They should, on the other hand, it seems to me, be encouraging their membership to adopt measures to prevent the kinds of incidents that will if not curtailed cause the insurance rates which they suggest to be required to be so prohibitive that the independent companies will be unable to compete.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we have a present and potential danger about which we can do something. It is a true piece of consumer legislation in its present form and like several other pieces of consumer legislation, it costs very little and it may save a great deal.