

the very large storage reservoir facilities, which inundate a very large amount of land.

Mr. JONES. I don't think you are going to get any kind of system, secondary, primary, or otherwise, that will get better than 95 percent.

Mr. VIVIAN. You feel there is no hope of going in that direction?

Mr. JONES. At the present time one of the purposes of this hearing today is to try to find out how we can get a hundred percent efficiency because these waters—for instance, take Cincinnati, Ohio. In the low-flow period where you normally accommodate 200,000 cubic feet per second, the water is being used as much as six times, so you are going to have to have these treatment plants, both in the heavy industrial section of the Ohio River, the Monongahela, and the streams in the West Virginia area which has its confluence below on the Ohio, as to have a general pattern of stream abatement not only to make water available for use six times, but as much as nine times as you have in the Connecticut River.

Mr. VIVIAN. The State of Michigan recently passed a tax benefit for firms that install pollution abatement equipment. I wonder if there is any uniformity of action on this approach across the country.

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. VIVIAN. Has any model law been suggested or recommended?

Mr. JONES. No. The only study I know is made by our subcommittee of Government Operations which I discussed with Mr. Waggonner earlier. I will be glad to make available to you—and they have had wide distribution—but I don't think there is a general consensus of the Governors of the respective States how to go about it.

Nor is there a demand of industry generally that I know anything about for such an arrangement.

The industrial groups that came before our subcommittee last week and the Committee of Public Works did not seek that approach.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Ryan?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to thank Congressman Jones for joining us this morning and sharing his vast knowledge of this subject with us. I'm sure the subcommittee will certainly benefit by your views and the expression of them this morning, Mr. Jones. I think you have shown us, as you have demonstrated in your service in Congress, that you have a great national outlook on this problem. I think this is one of the great assets which you bring to the Congress, and which is reflected in the work of your subcommittee.

I was interested in your statement about the failure of the State of New York to provide advance notice to the city of Rochester. Could you elaborate on that? Was it made in a report of the Monroe County Grand Jury in December of 1965, which was reporting on the pollution investigation?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. RYAN. Well, we will follow it up from there.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Jones, I want to thank you.

Mr. JONES. I would like to add one thought, Mr. Chairman. The question that has been discussed about Lake Erie and its enormous problem. Of course, Lake Erie has more natural pollution than any of the other lakes. The suggestion of those who advocate the expenditures of some billion dollars for dredging, bar removals, and to cor-