

versial, and I recommend that you get additional opinions of responsible parties.

Senator MUSKIE. We will do that. We will write some letters tomorrow. I think the indications that we had in Mr. Shuck's testimony and others in California were enough to concern us and to prompt us to ask to what extent the automotive industry shares that concern, to what extent it is considering methods of controlling the emission of oxides of nitrogen connected with the automobile and what the prospects are.

Mr. Mann this morning made the point that he wished the industry might know well in advance what might be expected of it so that it could prepare for any requirements that may come. It seems to me there are enough clues here to suggest that the industry ought to be looking at the problem, and I am sure it is from what has been said this morning.

So, we simply want to get the details. First of all, your evaluation of the seriousness of the problem; secondly, what you have been able to do thus far and what its prospects are. I take it we will get into that phase of the hardware tomorrow in the field visits.

I might say in addition that we had been scheduled to have additional witnesses in Denver on this subject from the National Center for Atmospheric Research. We wish we had those witnesses before we came here but we had to cancel the Denver hearing because of the Senate floor activity. We had to cancel Denver and we will go back and have those witnesses at another time. Again, we are not rushing to hasty conclusions here.

Mr. CAPLAN. Thank you.

Senator MUSKIE. Our next witness this afternoon is Miss Olga Madar, executive board member and director, United Automobile Workers, Recreation Department, appearing for Walter Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers.

Miss Madar, it is a pleasure to welcome you this afternoon.

STATEMENT OF OLGA MADAR, EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBER AND DIRECTOR, UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS, RECREATION DEPARTMENT, APPEARING FOR WALTER REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS

Miss MADAR. Thank you very much.

My name is Olga M. Madar, and I appear here today at the request of the president of our union, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, and on behalf of the million and one-half members of the United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

I have looked forward to the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee and expressing the concern and interest of the officers and the membership of our union as it relates to our living environment. I have followed closely the workings of the members of this subcommittee and of its distinguished chairman, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, and I have been impressed with your response to the American peoples' call for the abatement of the pollution of air and water.

I wish to stress at this point since I am not a scientist or a technician, I will not be discussing with you the chemical and scientific data which

comprises this complex field of air pollution. Our members are not scientists or chemists either; however, they are citizens who reside in communities throughout this country and are affected daily by the air and water pollution problems which confront our Nation.

The union has a commitment to the goals of enhancing our living environment, as stated by President Reuther and supported by the delegates at the 20th UAW Constitutional Convention in Long Beach, Calif., in May 1966:

He [President Johnson] has outlined the program for warring upon blight and pollution and ugliness and has asked us to "organize for action and rebuild and reclaim the beauty we inherited."

The UAW has answered this call to action, and we intend to persevere in our efforts, in cooperation with all interested persons and groups in the United States and Canada, until together we succeed in checking the alarming deterioration of our land, water and atmosphere and restoring a wholesome living environment throughout our two nations.

In your letter to Mr. Reuther, you indicated that the prime purpose for the hearing here in Detroit is to review the progress and problems associated with automobile emission control devices and other matters he wished to bring to your attention. Therefore, I will not be limiting my remarks exclusively to the automobile.

It should be clearly understood that 1 million of our members work in the automobile industry and would be affected by the technological changes and economic consequences resultant from a stringent and high-standard automobile exhaust control program. They are nevertheless first and foremost American citizens and consumers and have to breathe the same air and drink and bathe in the same water as people who work for insurance companies, department stores, and government. Despite the fact that they work in the automobile industry, neither they nor their children develop any immunity to automobile exhaust pollutants or any other pollutants.

President Reuther expressed the opinion of the majority of our members in his statement before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on the problems of the cities, December 5, 1966:

And I find the notion that auto workers will fight to slow down the application of modern technology to transportation problems absurd.

The UAW has a long and consistent history of fighting for better health and safety standards in the plant, and we will continue this battle. However, we make little progress when we find that the gains in better health are negated when the worker leaves the plant and finds his community's living environment polluted from all kinds of sources. We intend to take on this community fight for better health and safety with the same vigor and tenacity as we have the plant problem.

In order that the record may be set straight, the UAW believes and supports the basic fundamental principle that no one has the right to pollute our environment. We also support the enactment of stricter legislation and the allocation of greater funds to implement and enforce this principle.

The day has long passed when we can rationalize our willful neglect and abuse of the air, water, and land by stating the false assumption that the American economy will suffer and the gross national product

will decline if we put the health and welfare of the people ahead of economic profits.

An even greater threat to the American economy is the spectre of a population suffering in epidemic proportions from illness and disease, and even death, from many more and severe catastrophes as the London killer fogs, Donora, Pa., disasters and the recent incident in New York City. I can add, we find equally absurd the statements by some people that industry cannot technically solve the problems of air pollution or that it cannot solve it without wrecking the economy. Every piece of significant social legislation throughout history, child labor laws, industrial health and safety laws, and social security, to name a few, have been resisted on the basis that the economy could not support them. History and the present affluence of our society serve as excellent witnesses to the fallacy of these claims.

Pollution cannot be treated or understood in a vacuum, so perhaps it would be wise to take a closer look at today's urban America. Here again we will be repeating many of the things that you know but I expect it is important to say them again because apparently they are not understood throughout our population.

We find ourselves in the midst of a population explosion which indicates an increase of 45 percent by the year 2000. Urban sprawl has created satellite cities as well as contributed to the deterioration of our big cities, which is highlighted by slums, blight, and ghettos.

We are the most mobile society on the face of the earth—our science and technology is the most advanced the world has ever seen, providing both abundance in material goods, as well as contributing to problems never before encountered by man. Parenthetically may I say never have we said that the technology of the automobile industry is not sufficient to combat some of the problems that we are now encountering.

The deterioration of our natural resources is not only a national problem, but also a national disgrace. And, in the midst of all of this is an air and water pollution problem of such magnitude that it has caused some of our leading social thinkers and scientists to conclude that we are in the midst of a struggle of life and death if some rapid, bold and enlightened steps are not taken immediately.

If we are to deal realistically with our Nation's air pollution problem, we must first acknowledge that it is not a problem of a local nature, restricted by the artificial governmental boundaries of cities, counties, or States, but that it is truly a national and, indeed, an international problem, to be dealt with through the cooperative efforts of all levels of government.

We in Detroit are well aware that our good neighbors in Windsor, Canada, are oftentimes affected by the pollution emanating from industry and others in our community. The downriver suburban chemical plants and steel mills oftentimes make us in Detroit aware of their presence when the wind is blowing in the right direction. For the record let me also say that the downriver suburbs are also suffering from the pollution of industry here in Detroit.

Our Nation's brief experience in water pollution rapidly brought us to the realization that local enforcement, or lack of it, was not the answer in abating and controlling water pollution. The need for

cooperative and coordinated effort of government at all levels, as well as industry, educational institutions, and private individuals is the only realistic, workable solution to this problem. The present administration bill, entitled, "The Air Quality Act of 1967," provides for action to be taken in the establishment of national emission levels, establishment of regional airsheds, Federal grants for inspection programs, improved enforcement procedures, research on fuel additives, and a 50-percent increase in Federal research funds. We feel, at this time, that this bill will lead to a cooperative and coordinated effort and deserves the wholehearted support of the American people.

The Federal Government has taken its first big step in automobile emission control by establishing national standards for the 1968 models. If we are to use California as an example of what these devices can achieve, we may be only deceiving ourselves in assuming that a significant reduction in air pollution will be forthcoming.

Beginning with the 1966 model year, automobiles sold in the State of California were required to meet certain exhaust emission standards. After careful deliberation and consultation with the automotive industry, it was determined that the technology was available to meet the standards of the California State Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. As you learned in Los Angeles last week, in certifying these devices, the State of California was assured by the automobile industry that there would be a 70-percent reduction in exhaust hydrocarbons. After a careful testing and analysis program, the State engineers found that there was a steady increase in the number of vehicles unable to perform up to the standards. It was found that 87 percent of the vehicles tested with mileage over 20,000 failed to meet the standards, with the projection that at the 50,000 mileage level all the devices would fail.

The Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District also reviewed data from the 1966 test vehicles. Both the State and county officials agreed that there was need for improvement in the systems and devices. Projections indicate that even if the 70-percent figure could be reached, Los Angeles County would still not achieve acceptable air quality in the next decade.

The growth curve of the automobile industry and automobile output, coupled with population projections, gives rather clear indications that the Los Angeles situation of today may just be the forerunner of greater problems to come in other metropolitan areas. If the present control devices are the best the automobile industry can develop, then perhaps it may become necessary to band the internal combustion engine from use in metropolitan areas. We frankly feel that the automobile industry can do better; however, we question the willingness of the industry to devote the time, energy, and financial resources to the solution of the problem.

Industry's past concern for the health and safety of the consumer is best reflected by its hesitancy to voluntarily solve these problems on its own initiative. The legislative route seems to be the only one available to achieving more rapid progress in the control device program. Coming off one of the highest profit years in the industry's history, lack of financial resources surely cannot be one of the stumbling blocks. The future of the internal combustion engine is truly depend-

ent upon the sense of urgency and priority given to the development of a totally effective automobile emission control device system.

The livability of urban America is dependent upon an all-inclusive approach to the problems of housing, education, employment, and land-use planning. There is also a great need for the development of a mass transportation system, as well as finding new ways of solving the pollution problem we are discussing today. The need for a vehicle which is both compact and free of fumes has caused us to take a more serious look at other means of propulsion, including the electric and fuel cell-driven engines. With each passing day, it appears that the wisdom of this approach becomes more creditable.

We have made a start in the area of control and abatement of water pollution. The program has had more than its fair share of false starts and foot dragging by industry and some local government officials. We heard the cries in the water pollution control program of "Go slow, we don't know enough about all of the aspects of water pollution," "The technology is not far enough advanced," "The cost will cause many businesses and factories to close," and "The problem is really not that bad, so why get all worked up about it?" And, we are now hearing these same remarks as it relates to air pollution control.

There are some who are concerned with the cost of air pollution control devices, and the industry has said that they feel the consumer is not willing to absorb the additional cost. The consumer is already paying the cost for air pollution control devices and will continue to pay the cost through his tax dollars in supporting Federal grant programs for research on improving control techniques. The price increase on the 1967 models, along with the industry's unusually high-profit picture in relation to other U.S. manufacturing industries, make it quite evident that industry can well afford to absorb the cost of air pollution control devices.

As we talk about air and water, I feel that we really are discussing what "quality" air and water is truly befitting a Great Society, and I have no doubts in my mind that the American people want, will support, and will, when properly informed, demand that this quality be the highest attainable within the known technology. I also believe that they will want this quality continuously enhanced with greater emphasis placed on the development and application of more sophisticated technology.

Time is not on our side, and the solution will not come without sacrifice from all sectors of American society, but I have great faith in the American people for they have always met the challenge when great problems have threatened their well-being.

The UAW stands ready to meet the challenge and pledges our support to the implementation of a program which will truly relegate the memory of air and water pollution to a position of infamy in the past history of our great Nation.

Let me, if I might, just add a few words to the prepared testimony.

As I indicated, I am not expert on hydrocarbons or carbon oxide or nitrogen oxide—this is important information that we need to have and which I am glad that the subcommittee is gathering. Like most

people, I depend upon the technicians and industry and Government and the pros in the field to provide this information.

From some of the comments which I heard this morning from industry, I venture to say that I can read the American public a little bit better than they can. People are learning that they have been taken down the garden path of complacency. They were informed and are still being informed that the situation is not critical. It is my opinion and I am sure the opinion of many people in this country that little bits of pollution, if not curbed or eliminated, can only have the inevitable result of endangering human life.

The consumer, I think, takes the available facts which are given to him and then proceeds from there to take his position on what he shall purchase. I submit to you that I don't believe he has been given all of the available facts—at least, he has not given the available facts in terms of the amount of pollution that is in the air caused by auto emission in the last 15 years.

I believe if the same emphasis had been placed on the safety features of cars that we placed on the color of the interior and that we placed on the clock which never worked and for which the consumer paid, the average citizen would select the car with safety features. In fact, I believe the consumer is shocked to learn where the automobile industry has placed its priorities in advertising and research.

The consumer is paying for this, has been paying for it for quite some time and currently has a big bill both in air and water pollution which is an accumulated bill, one which could have been prevented to a great extent if we had submitted to the American public that there was more than a choice between cleanliness and jobs. We could have had jobs and clean air and clean water, and we could have shared in the profits that were made by getting the kinds of control devices that could have prevented this pollution.

I am appalled at some of the comments of the State legislators who talk about Federal controls. I am appalled because when we ask, "What have you done about air pollution in your State?" "Do you know the extent of pollution?" "How long has this been going on," we find that too many legislators are more concerned about profits and jobs than the health of the people.

The only thing that has worked to date, unfortunately, is not an appeal to the local legislators and the State legislators in terms of morality rights which are involved and the health of the people but the Federal money carrot which has been dangled before them. I, like others, would be glad to join with, I am sure, many of the Congressmen who would want to see voluntary action on the part of State and local governments in moving more expeditiously in this regard.

I would be hopeful that, at long last, industry would voluntarily take steps to prevent pollution; but history in our experience has not proven that they are prone to do so. I am sure that the membership which I represent would want to have some action taken by Government so that we can be assured that effective controls are instituted. Therefore, we hope that we would proceed aggressively on the legislative front.

We hope that you will continue to have hearings of this type and bring to the attention of the people of the United States all of the pertinent facts.

Mr. Chairman and Senators, as much as I would want to believe that the majority of the people in the United States do have the available facts, I don't believe they do. It is a minority which has just recently begun to get the information and have become concerned. They have registered their concern and you have reacted and we are grateful.

We need to accelerate the educational program because I am convinced that an informed American public is truly not an apathetic public—when they have the facts, they will demand that industry, voluntary groups and Government do everything necessary so that we may have clean air and water in our country.

Thank you very much.

Senator MUSKIE. Thank you very much, Miss Madar. We appreciate having your testimony and the expression of concern in the record. I will say frankly that it matches the concern that I get in my mail every day of the week.

It is true that the average layman does not appreciate the technical, scientific complexities of the problems, can't be expected to, but, nevertheless, I think he is aware that there is a problem. I think that most Americans are aware of the air pollution problem primarily as motorists.

In my State, for example, we don't have any air pollution problem except maybe too much clean air and not enough people breathing it. But most of the people in my State are aware of the problem because they drive on the turnpikes and expressways which link Maine with the metropolitan centers of America. They do breathe what comes out of the exhausts of these automobiles; they don't like it; they know at the end of a day's driving that they are more tired, more exhausted, more drained of energy than if they had not spent the day at some other form of hard work. So, they are all aware of the problem.

As a matter of fact, I think the greatest argument for air conditioning in automobiles is not relief from heat but relief from the odors emanating from other cars as one drives on these expressways; that is why I have it. So, I think it is appropriate from time to time that we have testifying before us a representative of the fairer sex, the more effective sex and a representative of consumer America.

Thank you very much.

Senator MURPHY. No questions.

Senator MUSKIE. I have never known Senator Murphy not to have something to say to a pretty woman.

Senator MURPHY. I learned years ago when a woman makes a statement you accept it and don't question it. [Laughter.]

I would just like to ask one question off the subject.

I notice that included here in your directorate is the Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America. Is that a new organization?

Miss MADAR. No. No; it isn't.

Senator MURPHY. How long has it been in existence?

Miss MADAR. Are you looking at the face sheet here, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America?

Senator MURPHY. Yes.

Miss MADAR. Most people don't know that included in our membership are workers employed in the agricultural implement industry.