pensation, engages in the business of repairing, servicing, and maintaining television, radio, or phonograph equipment normally used or sold for use in the home.

(3) The term "complainant" means a customer of a service dealer who has complained to the Commissioner concerning such service dealer.

(4) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

(5) The term "Council" means the District of Columbia Council.

SEC. 3. The Council may establish such regulations as may be reasonable for the conduct of service dealers and for the general enforcement of the various provisions of this Act in the protection of the public. The Commissioner shall enforce such regulations and distribute to each registered service dealer copies of this Act and of the regulations thereunder.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall keep a complete record of all registered service dealers and shall annually prepare a roster showing the names and addresses of all registered service dealers. A copy of the roster shall be made available to any person requesting it upon the payment of such sum as shall be established by the Council to cover the costs thereof.

SEC. 5. Each service dealer shall pay the fee required by this Act for each place of business operated by him in the District of Columbia and shall register with the Commissioner upon forms prescribed by the Commissioner. The forms shall contain sufficient information to identify the service dealer, including name, address, and other identifying data to be prescribed by the Commissioner. If the business is to be carried on under a fictitious name, such fictitious name shall be stated. If the service dealer is a partnership, identifying data shall be stated for each partner. If the service dealer is a corporation, data shall be included for each of the officers and directors of the corporation as well as for the individual in charge of each place of the service dealer's business.

SEC. 6. Upon receipt of the form properly filled out and receipt of the required fee, the Commissioner shall validate the registration and send a proof of such validation to the service dealer. The Council shall by regulation prescribe conditions upon which a person whose registration has previously been invalidated or has previously been refused validation, may have his registration validated.

SEC. 7. Every registration shall cease to be valid on June 30 of each year unless the service dealer has paid the renewal fee required by this Act in accordance with regulations issued by the Council.

SEC. 8. A registration shall cease to be valid when any of the information provided by the form specified in section 5 ceases to be current. The Council shall make regulations prescribing the procedure for keeping such registration information current.

SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful to act as service dealer without first having registered in accordance with the provisions of this Act and unless such registration is currently valid.

SEC. 10. The Commissioner may refuse to validate, or may invalidate temporarily or permanently the registration of a service dealer for any of the following acts or omissions done by himself or any employee partner, officer, or member of the service dealer and related to the conduct of his business:

(1) Making or authorizing any statement or advertisement which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.

(2) Making any false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or induce a customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of the equipment covered by this Act.

(3) Acting for more than one customer in a transaction without the knowledge or consent of all parties thereto.

(4) Any other conduct which constitutes fraud or dishonest dealing.

(5) Conduct constituting gross negligence.

(6) Failure in any material respect to comply with the provisions of this Act or regulations thereunder.

SEC. 11. All work done by a service dealer shall be recorded on an invoice in such detail as is required by regulations issued by the Council and shall describe all service work done and all parts supplied. If any used parts are supplied, the invoice shall clearly state that fact. One copy shall be given to the customer and one copy shall be retained by the service dealer for a period of at least one year.

SEC. 12. The service dealer shall return replaced parts to the customer excepting such parts as may be exempted from this requirement by regulations of the Council and excepting such parts as the service dealer needs to return to the manufacturer or distributor under a warranty arrangement.

SEC. 13. If a customer requests an estimate for labor and parts necessary for a specific job, the service dealer shall make such an estimate in writing and may not charge for work done or parts supplied in excess of the estimate without previous consent of the customer. The service dealer may charge a reasonable fee for making the estimate.

SEC. 14. A service dealer may not make the compensation of any employee, partner, officer, or member dependent upon the value of parts replaced in any equipment by, or with the consent of, such employee, partner, officer, or member.

SEC. 15. The use of the word "guarantee" and words of like import shall conform to the regulations adopted by the Council.

SEC. 16. Each service dealer shall maintain such records as are required by the regulations adopted to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such records shall be open for reasonable inspection by the Commissioner.

SEC. 17. No person required to have a valid registration under the provisions of this Act shall have the benefit of any lien for labor or materials unless he has such a valid registration.

SEC. 18. The Commissioner shall establish procedures for accepting complaints from the public against any service dealer.

SEC. 19. If the complaint does not appear to state any violations of this Act, or of the regulations made pursuant to this Act, the Commissioner shall so advise the complainant and take no further action.

SEC. 20. If such a complaint indicates a possible violation of this Act or of the regulations made pursuant to this Act, the Commissioner shall advise the service dealer of the contents of the complaint and, after the service dealer has had reasonable opportunity to reply thereto, the Commissioner shall make a summary investigation of the facts.

SEC. 21. If, upon summary investigation, it appears to the Commissioner probable that a violation of this Act, or the regulations thereunder, has occurred, the Commissioner in his discretion, may suggest measures that in his judgment would compensate the complainant for the damages he has suffered as a result of the alleged violation. If the servicedealer accepts the Commissioner's suggestions and performs accordingly, the Commissioner shall give such fact due consideration in any subsequent disciplinary proceeding. If the service dealer declines to abide by the suggestions of the Commissioner, the Commissioner may investigate further and may institute disciplinary proceedings in accordance with provisions of this Act.

SEC. 22. The fees prescribed by this Act shall be set by the Council according to the following schedule:

(1) The service dealer registration fee is not less than $25 nor more than $50 for each place of business in the District of Columbia.

(2) The annual renewal fee for a service dealer registration is not less than $25 nor more than $50 for each place of business in the District of Columbia, if renewed prior to its expiration date.

(3) The renewal fee for a registration that is not renewed prior to its expiration date shall be double the renewal fee required for a registration renewal prior to its expiration date.

SEC. 23. Any person who for the purpose of repairing a television or radio set removes the set from the premises of the owner shall furnish the owner at the time of such removal with a receipt containing all the following information:

(1) The name and business address of the person or business firm which will repair or authorize the repair of the television or radio set.

(2) The name of the person who actually removes the set from the owner's premises if different from the person referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Each and every address at which the television or radio set will be kept, repaired, or stored, if different from the address referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) A description including the make and model of the television or radio set removed from the premises.

(5) An estimate of the total charges, including parts and labor, to be levied for all services to be rendered.

(6) A statement of the total charges which will be levied if the television or radio set is returned without being repaired.

SEC. 24. In every instance in which charges in excess of $15 are levied for the repair of a television or radio set the person receiving payment shall give the person making payment a receipt at the time of payment containing all the following information:

(1) The name and address of the person making or authorizing the repairs.

(2) A statement of the total charges.

(3) An itemization and description of all parts placed in the set indicating the charges levied for each part.

(4) A statement of the charges levied for labor.

(5) A description of all other charges.

SEC. 25. No liens or other rights to maintain possession of the television or radio set pending payment of charges for repair, shall exist where the total charges levied for the repair of a television or radio set exceeds the higher of (1) the amount estimated in writing under paragraph (5) of section 23, or (2) a written revision of such estimate signed and dated by the owner of the television or radio set.

SEC. 26. Any waiver by the set owner of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed contrary to public policy and shall be void and unenforceable.

SEC. 27. Any person who violates any provision of this Act shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

SEC. 28. This Act shall take effect ninety days following the date of its enactment.

(Mr. BIESTER (at the request of Mr. BUSH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BIESTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. BUSH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KEITH'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

(Mrs. REID of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BUSH) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Air Quality Act of 1967 deserves our support.

Most of us remember the days not too long ago when people joked about the smog in Los Angeles, the smoke in Pittsburgh, the wind-blown soot in Chicago, and so on; and we are aware that air pollution is by no means a new problem. Indeed, as far back as A.D. 61 the philosopher Seneca complaind about "the heavy air of Rome" with its "pestilent vapors." But over the years everyone seemed to assume that nature would automatically take care of eliminating the tons of contamination pumped into the atmosphere—and perhaps 50 years ago this was true to some extent. Today, however, no one jokes about it anymore. Times have changed. Nature, despite all its wonders, is fighting a losing battle. Pollution has become one of the most urgent public problems facing Americans today. Effective programs to control pollution must receive priority—and air pollution is particularly critical since, unlike water which can be treated for reuse, there is no method of treating the air around us before it is "consumed."

It is my privilege to represent a diversified congressional district, one county of which lies within the northeastern Illinois metropolitan area which includes Chicago; and in a recent report by the U.S. Public Health Service, this metropolitan area was ranked second among 65 in terms of the severity of air pollution. As you know, the Chicago region and the surrounding counties in northeast Illinois comprise one of the largest and most prosperous industrial and urban areas in the world; but like other urban areas across the country, also, we are finding in Illinois that we must pay a considerable price for this industrial and commercial development in the form of air pollution from increasing numbers of automobiles, houses, factories, powerplants, incinerators, and so forth. With an additional 2.5 million more people expected in the area during the next 25 years, the prospects of maintaining future air quality are alarming, to say the least.

In a recent technical survey on the management of air resources in the area by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, more than one-half of the 177 communities reported air pollution problems. In 9 percent of them, including Chicago and 15 suburbs with a combined population of close to 4 million, air pollution was described as a major problem. Automobiles alone in these 6 counties of the metropolitan area account for over 2 million tons of pollutants a year. Local meteorologic data further confirms the potential hazard of pollution to public health and increasing dangers of respiratory tract illnesses. The economic effects of air pollution in the area are likewise known to be extensive, just as on a national basis it is estimated that losses in property deterioration and damage amount to some $11 billion a year.

While I speak of Illinois, we must recognize that air pollution knows no political boundaries and obviously involves intergovernmental considerations. This is why I think this legislation is essential and is a step in the right direction. Sooner or later, the menace of air pollution will extend to all congressional districts as our population and economy grow unless positive action is taken now. In this connection, let me say that I fully understand the concern of our colleagues from California regarding the elimination of the auto emission waiver provision for their State. My daughter, who is a college student in the Los Angeles area, has written me many times about the difficult smog problem there.

While I support the Air Quality Act, let me further say that I do not feel that we can solve this dilemma solely by adding more Federal programs, however visionary. I think we need to do more than that. We need to strive for a more meaningful and realistic partnership between Government and industry if our efforts are to achieve the desired goal. For this reason, I introduced H.R. 6388 on March 1, 1967, to authorize a tax credit to encourage business and industry to move ahead in tackling the air- and water-pollution problem. Since the necessary facilities for control of industrial pollution are essentially nonproductive and must be built specifically for the needs of a particular industry, it seems to me that a tax incentive plan which will allow for greater flexibility is most appropriate. My bill, along with others on the same subject, is pending in the Committee on Ways and Means—and I urge the committee and the House leadership to also give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration.

SHIFT IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Mr. McCLURE (at the request of Mr. BUSH) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Star of October 29 seems to have escaped the attention of most Members of Congress despite the fact that it heralds a major shift in U.S. foreign policy. The article says:

In an effort to lure the Russians into talks about limiting costly anti-ballistic missile systems, the Pentagon has quietly dropped demands for on-site inspection to police any such arms pact.

According to the article, Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul C. Warnke said recently that in negotiations with the Russians for an ABM pact, the administration hopes "to avoid bogging down in the perennially difficult issue of international inspection." The Evening Star adds that this was confirmed by high-ranking officials, who admitted it was a departure from traditional policy.

As if it all were a foregone conclusion, the article states that the President and the Secretary of Defense told Soviet leaders that reductions could be made without either formal agreement or any kind of international inspection system. And finally it says that Mr. McNamara hopes to make it as easy as possible for the Russians by avoiding "unnecessary embarrassments." Perhaps one of those embarrassments might be the constantly recurring rumors of Russian missiles in Cuba.

If this article is meant as a trial balloon, I feel compelled to express my indignation at the proposal less my silence be construed as acquiesence.

In their late-blooming apprehension over the Chinese threat, administration officials have found it convenient to forgive and forget past Soviet transgressions. Are we to forget then that this is the one nation which has fomented every single international incident since the end of World War II?

Whether this change in attitude is attributable to naievete or by design, I am not prepared to say. Certainly in the minds of most Americans the Soviet threat is as real today as it ever was before.

This is one more example of a foreign policy that does not evolve, but rather deteriorates. The Russians are well aware that time is on their side. If they wait long enough, American officials will give in on all points in dispute. I can well imagine what effect this will have on the North Vietnamese. There will be no rush to the conference table—the longer they wait, the bigger our concessions will be.

And where does this leave the proposed antiballistic missile system which the Pentagon—with such fanfare you would think they had a patent on the idea—recently announced it would build? The American people have a right to know the answer.

This administration supposedly puts great faith in consensus politics. Our leaders might ponder what the result would be if the citizens of this Nation were asked whether they preferred the building of an ABM system or reliance on the Russian word that they were not utilizing such a system themselves.

The heart of any international agreement—whether formal or informal—regarding strategic and defensive missile systems must necessarily be onsite inspections. To do otherwise may well signal the beginning of the end.

I include the article as a part of my remarks:

PENTAGON VOIDS ON-SITE POLICING FOR ABM PACT

(By George Sherman)

In an effort to lure the Russians into talks about limiting costly anti-ballistic missile systems, the Pentagon has quietly dropped demands for on-site inspection to police any such arms pact.

Policy-making officials says that President Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara have told the Soviet leadership that the first mutual reductions in ABM's could be made without either formal agreement or any kind of international inspection system.

These officials argue that American "detection devices"—space satellites and high-flying reconnaissance planes—are now efficient enough to verify any "informal" agreement. In essence the same "unilateral verification" used in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty would be applied to the ABM's.

So far the Russians have not responded. They have said they will talk about both