

abatement in the area of water pollution or any other particular area. I completely agree with him that there is no reason or excuse to accept the status quo if we are going to even think about today much less tomorrow. He has certainly done more than his part to awaken people to the perils of all kinds of pollution. His committee has finally, I think, awakened the Congress to the needs of the country in water pollution. I just have one comment and that is that we in Congress and the people in the country have accepted Federal and joint programs wherein we can build water resource projects and watershed projects, but we have not given the proper attention to these God-given streams and lakes that have been ours through the years. We are more interested in developing new projects than we are in preserving and maintaining for future generations those which have been with us all the while.

So, I think that Mr. Blatnik has brought to this committee the leadership he has been exercising in his own committee through the years.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Vivian?

Mr. VIVIAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has touched upon quite a number of items, some of very great interest in my own district. Lake Erie borders my district. The "deadest" part of Lake Erie lies just off of the shores in my district.

The comment you made that the layers of water below the surface of Lake Erie are growing increasingly stagnant, is most pertinent. When strong winds blow in from the east toward the beaches in my district, the beaches become littered with various and sundry forms of marine growth and sludge from the lower levels of the lake. Even on quiet days, the water is turbid. Along the beaches signs are posted year after year saying "Not safe for swimming."

Now the question which I really want to get to is what will it cost to clean this vast lake and its neighbors, and how can we reduce that cost by intelligent actions now? According to an estimate made for me by competent persons from Federal agencies, it will cost approximately \$5 billion over the next 20 years to clean up Lake Erie. Part of these funds will be used for replacement of wornout sewage treatment facilities, and part for installation of new facilities. Extended to all the Great Lakes, the estimate was some \$20 billion; extended to the entire Nation, the estimate rose to about \$100 billion, an enormous sum. But, as you pointed out, that amount is comparable to the \$40 billion we have spent on roads in the last decade, so the total cost and the rate are not at all unreasonable, in terms of our capabilities.

Now, let me ask, is there any evidence available to your committee that this great sum could be reduced to a more nominal figure by any research now in progress? Such as, for example, the research underway on the powdered coal sewage treatment process? I understand that the optimistic proponents of this process expect to reduce the cost of treatment of sewer wastes to about half; conversely, detractors dispute that claim, and argue that little or no money will be saved.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is the expected gain, and the laboratory model suggests that reduction would be correct, but to prove it out, you have to build what we call demonstration or semicommercial or pilot models, larger models. You have a continuous flow and much larger