mountains, to see clearer and to do better in behalf of peace, in behalf of humanity. Perhaps we can go back to the origin of prophecy and begin anew the works of peace—in our land and abroad—and see in the vision of the prophet: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings that announceth salvation. . . ."

LET US CLEAN UP THE AIR—NOT THE MOTORIST'S POCKETBOOK

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the administration has proposed a tax on lead used in automotive gasoline. The proposed tax would produce approximately $1.6 billion a year in revenue. According to the Treasury Department, the additional cost to the motorist would be approximately 2.3 cents per gallon of gasoline.

I realize that any administration abhors deficits. This is as it should be. Unhappily, however, this too often results in unwarranted or ill-considered revenue proposals for the purpose offsetting a budget deficit.

The administration's proposed lead tax clearly falls within this category. I shall not comment upon the patent absurdity of attempting to eliminate the entire deficit with the tax on a single commodity. Nor shall I dwell upon the contradictory positions being taken by the administration with respect to removing the lead from gasoline.

I have observed, however, that there is a Technical Advisory Board, which has been formed by the Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of studying lead removal from gasoline; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has distributed a questionnaire to refiners and other interested parties and is currently studying the problem to determine what regulations might most appropriately deal with it; the House has passed legislation giving the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to issue regulations. A bill is presently before the other body, in which a number of related bills had been introduced and hearings had been previously held.

It is simply incredible to me that considering the large sums of money that are being spent by the Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the right answer to this very complex problem, that the administration would superimpose this tax proposal, which is inconsistent to the point of being mutually exclusive of the studies carried on by both Houses of the Congress and two departments of the executive branch.

This is clearly wasteful, nonproductive and bad public administration.

Let me hasten to add that I am not opposed to removing lead from gasoline. Like most Americans, I find myself somewhat confused by the conflicting positions of the many experts in this field. Some tell us that lead is bad for people. Others say that this is not so; it is simply bad for the devices which would remove that portion of automotive emissions, which are bad for people. Yet other equally expert voices state that, in point of fact, those ingredients which would have to be added to replace lead, if it were prohibited, would be far more harmful to the public and the atmosphere than the lead itself.

Simply stated, I am for doing whatever needs to be done to help clean up air pollution. If this involves removing lead, then I am all for it. It is even conceivable that by placing a substantial tax on the lead used in gasoline, this would, over a period of time, give such a competitive advantage to unleaded gasoline, that it would take over the entire market.

Personally, I think this is the wrong way to go.

For one thing, the Nation's independent small business marketers, such as oil jobbers, would be faced with vast and, indeed, prohibitive expenditures to put in a third pump to dispense unleaded regular grade gasoline, if it were allowed to be marketed simultaneously with both regular leaded gasoline and leaded premium gasoline.

It just seems to me that if lead is to be prohibited, then no regular gasoline should be allowed to contain lead. This would eliminate many millions of dollars of needless and nonproductive expenditures for additional pump and tank installations.

Beyond this, however, I feel that this lead tax proposal would be most unfair to the Nation's consumers of gasoline—the American motorist.

The President's proposal would result in the revenue from the lead gasoline lead tax going not to the Highway Trust Fund but to the general Government coffers. Let us analyze that for a moment.

One of the reasons that a gallon of gasoline today is a relatively good buy is that the portion of the cost representing Federal tax provides roads on which to drive the car while burning the gasoline. Nothing is more useless than gasoline or, for that matter even his automobile to the motorist if there are no adequate roads upon which to drive. To me the dedication of the funds derived from the excise tax on automotive gasoline has been one of the real values for the consumers of this Nation. It is a little like getting the bread for the sandwich free when you pay for the salami.

Clearly any increase in the tax on gasoline, whether on lead or any other specific ingredient is really a tax on the motorists. It simply is not fair to take the money from an excise tax on the motorist's gasoline and spend it elsewhere. This is particularly true in light of the many representations made to the motoring public over a long period of years that the funds from gasoline taxes would be available only for highways.

Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to read in the press that the outlook for this proposal is unfavorable. For myself, I have the greatest faith in Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee and his very able colleagues. I am sure that when they have finished analyzing this somewhat ridiculous proposal, that they will take appropriate action to insure that the Nation's motorists are not subjected to this unconscionable and unjustifiable burden.

SENATE—*Thursday, July 2, 1970*

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will come to order.

The Senate, under previous agreement, will now adjourn until noon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 6, 1970

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 7 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Wednesday, July 1, 1970, until Monday, July 6, 1970, at 12 noon.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO