

to have to maintain a pluralistic responsibility in the area of pollution: there will have to be major local decisions, and there will have to be State and regional decisions, and there will have to be some Federal decisions. Moreover, in some of these industrial problem areas, we may have, in the long run, to have Federal enforcement, if only to avoid geographic motion of industry for no other reason than local differences in pollution enforcement.

It seems to me this is a very difficult problem. It involves all sorts of economic and political questions, and I think you gentlemen have my sympathy for having to try to deal with it.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, may I make one very brief comment?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes.

Mr. VIVIAN. To the extent to which industry-by-industry standards would be not only a guide, but also a goal to industry to stimulate research and development itself in order to minimize their cost of abating pollution as well as an incentive to the installation and operation of pollution control equipment they would be beneficial. Pollution reporting today is in a very primitive state. We really have no hour-by-hour information from industries, or from any other source of pollution. I feel this is an area to which your panel might give some further attention.

Mr. DADDARIO. There are a multitude of questions that come to mind which we have just not had time to ask and which we will send to you.

I had meant, when we started these hearings, Dr. Spilhaus, to congratulate you on the confirmation by the Senate yesterday of your appointment to the Science Board of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. SPILHAUS. Thank you, sir. That's the first I knew of it. I was on the train.

Mr. DADDARIO. We are very pleased particularly because this committee has legislative jurisdiction over the National Science Foundation.

I would like to state further that, as the witnesses from the Federal agencies appear before us, we intend to see how the Federal agencies plan to implement the recommendations included in the reports which you gentlemen have submitted through the committees you chaired. In the remaining minutes I would like to touch on another point.

You both suggest in your testimony that we should use the knowledge that is available while looking for better methods for the future. And, in your report, Dr. Spilhaus, you have touched on the desirability of separating sanitary and storm sewers. The cost will be in the vicinity of \$25 to \$30 billion, and some people suggest that the benefits which would result might not warrant the expenditure of such large amounts. Perhaps we ought to do more research into this area before proceeding with the expenditures. Should we move ahead with such expenditures to separate sanitary and storm sewers, or should we do more research, or both?

Dr. SPILHAUS. I think you should do a little bit of each. You need, as has been said, to have research and technological, large-scale experimentation going on in parallel; each one will support the other.

Mr. DADDARIO. This is an area that we should study very carefully.