

8. Research facilities construction and operation, including  
Regional laboratories  
Federal research centers  
University research centers.
9. Training and graduate fellowship programs in environmental sciences, pollution control and underlying basic sciences.
10. Acid mine drainage program.
11. Strip mine reclamation program

Other administrative actions:

1. The Science Advisor, with Treasury, HEW and Interior, to study fiscal controls and incentives. (See page 15-A.)
2. The Director of the Budget, with HEW, Interior, and Agriculture, to study the organization of pollution control activities
3. The President to meet with the presidents of the automobile manufacturing companies to set a timetable for exhaust controls.

Other proposals

1. A special program for the disposal of junked automobiles could be developed using a small part of the 10% excise tax on automobiles to establish a revolving fund, which could also be used to support exhaust emission control programs.
2. The question of applying effluent charges is highly controversial, and will require a substantial amount of study and discussion before specific proposals are made. The Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the operating agencies need to have a thorough discussion of the issue.



III. Probable Support for the Program Interest Groups

Municipal, mayors, and county associations.

Scientific and technical societies generally--particularly in biological sciences and health fields (AAAS, NTA, APHA, etc.)

National civic associations--such as LWV, General Federation of Women's Clubs, etc.

Conservation groups--National Wildlife Assn., Izaak Walton League, Audobon Society, etc.

Congressional

Senate - Strong bipartisan support could be developed through the Muskie subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee. Some problems of committee jurisdiction may arise which will require careful coordination.

House - The Northern urban congressmen can be expected to support the program. Congressman Blatnik of Minnesota would be the logical leader of the effort to enact a strong anti-pollution program. Committee jurisdiction is more serious in the House, where air pollution legislation is heard in the Interstate Committee rather than Public Works.

#### IV. Probable Opposition

##### Interest Groups

Substantial industry opposition will develop, both overt and covert. Such groups as NAM, Manufacturing Chemists, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Automobile Manufacturers Association will oppose any strengthening of Federal controls, although they will support research and limited State grant programs. The Manufacturing Chemists Association has been less strong in its opposition than the others.

The State and Territorial Health Officers and the State Attorney Generals have opposed proposals to strengthen Federal jurisdiction. The industry groups would, however, favor proposals for financial incentives to private industry.

##### Congressional

The ranking Republican on the House Public Works Committee, Cramer of Florida, will strongly oppose most of the proposals. The "conservative conditon" will be unhappy about extending Federal authority and the cost of the program. Difficulty may be encountered among Committee chairmen about possible overlap, duplication, etc., among the proposals. The proposals for tax relief for industry will offend many House liberals.



*Efficient  
Changes*

V. Estimates of Cost

A. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 1966 (in millions)

1. New legislation

Air pollution control

Increase authorization \$50

Auto emissions (2)<sup>1/</sup>

Water pollution control

Waste treatment construction 100'

Combined wastes 20

State grants 5

Federal installations 10

Low flow augmentation 15

Solid waste disposal

Solid waste disposal program 20

Disposal of junked autos (60)<sup>1/</sup>

2. Increases under existing authorities

90 rivers program 5

National monitoring system 10

Great Lakes program 5

Southwest program 5

Total, D/HEW \$305

<sup>1/</sup> Financed through revolving fund from auto excise tax.

B. Department of Agriculture	(in millions)
Research and Education <u>1/</u>	\$ 32.6
Action programs to control and regulate pollutants of rural origin <u>1/</u>	150.0
Facilities construction	40.3
Total	222.9
Loan authority for local facilities construction <u>2/</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total, Department of Agriculture	\$ 322.9

1/ Requires new legislative authority in part. Dollar breakdown between existing authority and new legislation required not available. Includes provision for additional research grant authority and factory inspection of agricultural chemical manufacturers.

2/ New legislative authority for waste disposal loans and increase Farmers Home Administration loan ceiling to \$450 million.



C. Department of the Interior

1966 (in millions)

National Fuel Program	\$ 5
(Consumer costs \$250-500 million annually)	
Open pit and strip mine rehabilitation	24
Acid mine drainage	5
Water quality network	10
Effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife	8
Research and training grants	1
Facilities construction grants	10
Ecological evaluations	<u>3</u>
Total, Department of the Interior	\$ 66
(Estimated 10-year cost)	\$ 355 million

Total:	<u>(in millions)</u>
D/HEW	\$ 305
Agriculture	322.9
Interior	<u>66</u>
Total	\$ 693.9

VI. Task Force Recommendations--Not Included

1. Presidential re-affirmation of recommendations in PSAC report "The Use of Pesticides"

This is not included specifically as much of the report is already being implemented and the recommendations are implicit in the proposals of the outline.

2. Appointment of various task forces, committees, etc.

This is omitted in the belief that an action program as proposed would be weakened by too many study suggestions. Most of the committees, etc., could be appointed later if thought necessary.

3. Separation of research and development activities from investigation and enforcement

The Task Force recommendation was unclear, and it was felt that the Budget Bureau study proposed in the outline would include this in its considerations.

4. The Environmental Health Center

This is not discussed in the outline because of its long history of difficulty. The matter may be resolved before a pollution program is ready for announcement.

5. Review of patent policies

A government-wide review has been going on for some time under the direction of OST.

6. Organization of the Taft Center

This specific proposal is treated more generally in the outline section dealing with research facilities.



VII. Fundamental Issues Raised

1. The basic question of Federal-State-local authority in regulation of pollution. To what extent should the Federal authority be expanded, and to what extent should the Federal Government support State and local programs?
2. Achieving a balance between regulation-enforcement and financial assistance-cooperative incentives. What is the proper relationship between the carrot and the stick?
3. The limits of Federal authority with regard to intrastate problems or the regulation of pollution from large industry which operates interstate or whose products are distributed interstate.
4. Reorienting the Federal bureaucracy and sorting out overlapping and occasionally conflicting agency jurisdictions.
5. Cost--to the Federal budget, the tax system, private industry, State and local governments.
6. Effective application of present knowledge and development of adequate facilities, manpower and programs to answer problems presently unsolvable.
7. The difficult specific situations, such as the Southwest salinity problem, which has been highly controversial both within and without the government. The California Central Valley reclamation project is another characteristic example.