

REMARKS OF HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND AT AIR POLLUTION CONTROL ASSOCIATION DINNER, COLONY MOTOR HOTEL, CRANSTON, RHODE ISLAND ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1961 AT 7 P.M.

PT
W.C.
I am delighted that your 13th annual observance of Cleaner Air Week gives me a new opportunity to talk to you on one of my favorite subjects, community air pollution. It is a pleasure to know that the New England Section of the Air Pollution Control Association has been so active and so productive during the past three years.

I had the honor of making a few remarks during your first dinner meeting exactly three years ago. Since then, a lot of water has gone over the dam. Or perhaps I should say, a lot of aerial pollutants have poured out of our home and factory chimneys, our power plants and municipal dumps, and the crank-cases and tailpipes of our automobiles and trucks and buses. But I also feel that we have made considerable progress during those three years in the necessary first steps toward the assessment of the air pollution problem and public recognition of its seriousness; and taken at least a few steps toward its solution.

Nineteen-fifty-eight, as all of you will recall, was the year of the big National Conference on Air Pollution in Washington. I felt at that time that this conference served an important

purpose in clarifying the issues in this field, in delineating some reasonable objectives, and - above all - in awakening the press and the public to a growing environmental problem which affects so importantly the national economy and the public health. I might add that your own continuing sponsorship of Cleaner Air Week similarly contributes to public awareness of this problem. Without public interest and public support, of course, none of us can make any progress at all in our fight for cleaner air.

I think it is probable that there will be another such Conference in 1962. I hope so. I know that your organization and many another have urged the Federal Government to take the initiative in this matter. Among other important groups which have made recommendations to that end are the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, and the Air Pollution Control Department of New York City. I believe that a national conference in 1962 could be of great value in evaluating our progress in this field since 1955, in suggesting new goals or time-tables if these are needed, and perhaps in stimulating earlier or more general use of control measures based on methods and equipment which are already available.

Over the past several years I have been deeply concerned with the possibilities for improvement of certain factors in our modern environment which have to do with public health. From the vantage point of my chairmanship of the Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations sub-committee in the House of Representatives, I have had a real opportunity to get acquainted with all our current health problems, including air pollution, in which I have long had a special interest.

As many of you know, my committee called for a detailed report from the Public Health Service on environmental health problems and held extended hearings, during which we took testimony from many outside specialists as well as those in PHS. Incidentally, several distinguished New Englanders were among our witnesses on the subject of air pollution, including Professors Rolf Eliassen, from M.I.T., and Ross McFarland and James Whittenberger, from Harvard's School of Public Health.

As a result of these hearings and my further study of the air pollution problem, I am convinced that its solution will require a cooperative, a joint approach, on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and local communities.

For none of these can do alone what needs to be done. My committee is taking active steps to make possible increased Federal participation in the collective job, to make sure that at least this one side of a many-sided obligation is met in full. (I know that it hardly needs emphasizing to this well-informed audience that industry too shares importantly in this obligation.) Included in the Federal role, I hope, will be provision for rendering financial as well as technical assistance to States and localities which seek to initiate more effective control programs.

You may be interested in a brief review of some of the things which the Federal Government has already been able to do, under present laws, for New England States and localities.

Both Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology have been conducting air pollution research since 1957 under Public Health Service grants. The PHS Division of Air Pollution has provided technical assistance here in Providence, in Boston, and in Berlin, New Hampshire, and helped to survey the air pollution problems throughout the State of Connecticut.

This summer, as part of a larger research project on atmospheric lead and body lead levels in certain occupational groups, analyses were made of the air in and near Boston's Sumner Tunnel, where especially high concentrations of motor vehicle exhaust emissions were to be expected.

Here in Providence, an intensive five-week study was initiated last July at the request of my good friend, Genaro Constantino, Chief of this city's Division of Air Pollution and Mechanical Equipment and Installations. This study was designed to improve knowledge of air pollution levels here and to help the local agency in developing greater competence in sampling and analyzing atmospheric contaminants.

In addition, the Public Health Service has maintained since 1957 one non-urban and at least one urban station of the National Air Sampling Network in every New England State. Many of these stations have recently begun to sample gaseous as well as solid pollutants.

There is certainly no doubt that New England - and especially Southern New England - has a serious and growing air pollution problem. For many of my facts and figures on this point, I am indebted to Bill Megonnell, whom you all

know, the Regional Consultant on Air Pollution in this area for the Public Health Service.

The northeast is at least six times as densely populated as the rest of the country; here are located 45, out of a national total of 108, Standard Metropolitan Areas. And it is people and people's activities which create air pollution.

The northeastern states consume well over one-third of the light and heavy fuel oils burned in this country, one-quarter of the bituminous coal, and practically all of the anthracite coal. As for manufacturing activity, over 35 percent of the nation's manufacturing employment is in this ten-State region. (In these figures, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey are included.)

In many New England communities, emissions from motor vehicles represent a significant proportion of the total air contamination. Another serious aspect of the air pollution problems here is the disposal of tremendous quantities of municipal, commercial, and industrial refuse. In congested areas, scarcity of land for sanitary landfills has led to common use of the open dump, where refuse is usually burned,

so that odors and smoke from these sources are widespread and common.

Many other source categories, of considerable importance to specific communities, could be listed. It is probable that nearly every type of source and kind of contaminant is encountered at some time and place in this section of the country.

So you can be sure that whatever I and my committee in Washington are able to accomplish in the direction of more effective Federal aid for States and localities, it will be needed and applied in ample measure right here in our own New England.

As most of you know, President Kennedy made a most forceful statement on the air pollution issue as a part of his message to Congress earlier this year on natural resources. "Although the total supply of air is vast," he said, "the atmosphere over our growing metropolitan areas - where more than half of the people live - has only limited capacity to dilute and disperse the contaminants now being increasingly discharged from homes, factories, vehicles, and many other sources." He further stated his intention to foster a more effective Federal program for protection

of this vital natural resource.

In my opinion, Secretary Ribicoff - who hails from our neighbor State of Connecticut and is doing a good job in the new administration - has also struck a mighty blow for cleaner air. Not long ago, he challenged the automobile industry to make devices that destroy air-polluting crankcase fumes standard equipment on all motor cars from 1964 on, or face legislation that would make factory installation mandatory.

I feel that I too have been successful in adding one more push to keep this good ball rolling. Representing as I do one of America's great industrial States, I consider myself one of industry's best friends. But it is industry's long-run interests which I seek to serve, because I believe that, in the long run, the best interests of industry are identical with those of the working man and the general public. And I can't help thinking that some branches of industry have been a little short-sighted in this matter of air pollution.

I am thinking particularly, of course, of the automobile industry and the oil industry. Although some of you may have read a condensed version of my comments -

since they were widely reported by the newspapers throughout the nation - I think you will all be interested in what I actually said about these industries on the floor of Congress this spring. If I may, I will repeat a part of it here. I said --

Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollutant sources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blow-by devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motorcar's total contribution to our air pollution problem.

Such devices were factory-installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available -- at a higher price, of course -- as optional dealer-installed

equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly but may also be highly hazardous to human health -- and since this new device eliminates a part of it at a low cost -- it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every city, but they certainly are in many cities. In the Los Angeles area refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions and, in addition, receives new cars with blow-by control devices factory installed.

In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, ^{is} one of the many states that receive almost none of the advantages insisted

upon in Los Angeles. New Jersey comes to mind because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both refineries and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

I should think that these two rich industries -- simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason -- would do everything they reasonably could do to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to avert the risk of drastic legislation which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands.

That was the end of my statement to Congress. I am sure you realize, however, that I do not consider those two great industries - which have contributed so much to our matchless American standard of living - as the sole offender

in this area. Throughout New England there are other industries which have done much less than they might have done in utilizing methods and equipment which are already available to reduce their own air polluting emissions.

Nor is industry the sole offender. The list is a familiar one to you.. It includes burning municipal dumps and municipally owned power plants. And dry cleaning establishments and backyard incinerators. And home furnaces improperly adjusted for efficient fuel combustion. And autos and trucks and buses improperly maintained, so that their emissions are bigger and blacker and smellier than they need to be, even without control devices.

Last but not least on our list of offenders are those many states and communities whose offenses are the sins of omission rather than emission ... governmental agencies and law-making bodies whose control regulations have not kept pace with increasing sources of air pollution and our increasing knowledge of effective abatement measures.

Since I have a little something to do with what happens at the Federal level, perhaps I had better close with my own ideas of what is needed at that level if our real progress during the past three years is to be sharply enough

accelerated in the next few years to keep pace with our swift industrial and technological growth.

We need - and you have heard this many times - more research on the nature and effects of air pollution, most of all on its health effects. I feel that the Public Health Service has made a good start here, but it had to start from scratch, to set up novel techniques and acquire or develop novel equipment, and to find or train qualified personnel. Moreover, we are dealing here with chronic health effects, with long-term effects, and many of the findings from sound projects initiated during the past few years have yet to be analyzed and interpreted. This kind of research must go on, and should be expanded. Likewise research into more efficient and less expensive methods for abating pollutant emissions at the source.

We need, as I have mentioned, more adequate provision for Federal aid to States and localities in setting up effective control programs - in technical assistance and in money.

Finally, the Federal Government needs that Environmental Health Center you have been hearing so much about lately.

I am wholly convinced of the desirability of this project, which will include as a major segment more adequate facilities for carrying on the Public Health Service's air pollution activities.

Let me try to tell you in closing just how much importance I do attach to the proposed Center.

This touches one of my interests which is far larger in scope than even the air pollution problem.

What kind of environment are we going to leave to our children? Our people multiply and crowd together into those endless chains of city-suburbs-city-suburbs-city. Our technology creates new chemicals faster than our scientists can measure their toxicity. Even if we can succeed in putting an end to radioactive fallout before it puts an end to us, the rising flood of old and new pollutants will increasingly soil our air and spoil our water. Our basic supply of potable water is threatened with exhaustion. Our good rich soil is being taken out of cultivation, by the hundreds of square miles, for multiple-lane highways and parking lots. Even if the

bumper-to-bumper traffic of a Sunday afternoon would let us drive somewhere in comfort, where could we find within driving range of our big cities a peaceful countryside?

I am proud of the tremendous progress we Americans have made in science and technology, and I want it to continue. I am even optimistic about it. If we start soon enough on a truly large-scale program to counteract the unwanted byproducts of that progress, then I think we shall have an excellent chance of bequeathing to our children an urban environment which will be worthy of this lucky land and its unsurpassed natural endowments.

The proposed Environmental Health Center is a project conceived in an order of magnitude that is comparable to the bigness of the problems it will seek to solve. Its realization will help us to make faster progress in air pollution control ... and to make America a healthier and happier place to be alive in.