

making an estimate of what might occur 5 years from now, simply clean up all the effluents and see what the river does. I have witnessed a very contaminated river begin to recover itself in as short a period as 9 weeks when certain industrial effluents stopped being dumped into it.

Mr. DADDARIO. Well, let's take a big proposition which has been put before us—the expenditure of some \$25 to \$30 billion for separating sanitary and storm sewers. Some people say we ought to begin this program immediately and make arrangements to spend this money. This is a big program which falls into this proposal of yours. Since a solution is available and we probably could obtain the moneys to do it, should we do it or should we in fact take a look at the environment within which this whole program would be developed to see what the causes and effects of it might be?

Mr. RAYNES. Of course I don't think every survey is ill-considered. Many of them are very worthwhile and should be carried out and used. Concerning this particular subject you are talking about, I particularly do think that all facets should be carefully thought out, both the separation and also the expenditure of such funds. But there are many other situations where it is quite obvious that cleaning up, for instance, an oily waste would be beneficial; that is the sort of individual situation I don't believe needs to be evaluated any further.

Mr. DADDARIO. The reason I asked you that question was that I thought you had that in mind. It seems to me that we ought to try to take that perspective because there is so much in what you say.

Mr. RAYNES. I don't believe that surveys made so that intelligent decisions can be based on them are not worthwhile. They certainly are. But surveys to continue the license to pollute I disagree with.

Mr. DADDARIO. On that particular point, somewhere in your report you talk about programs that ought to be authorized and that ought to have some flexibility without penalty.

Mr. RAYNES. Those are pilot programs; yes, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. You are taking into consideration that there are some problems.

Mr. RAYNES. Oh, sure.

Mr. DADDARIO. And that this must be considered.

Mr. RAYNES. But I believe it is the same kind of problem any production process faces. Someone designs a production process and builds a plant. Take a chemical plant; he starts it up and maybe the product isn't quite right the first week. Perhaps the yields are somewhat low or the costs are a little bit too high. He doesn't automatically abandon the whole idea. He goes ahead and works on his problems until he gets them fixed. I believe that pollution abatement technology today is available for many or most pollution problems, but it is not being applied. Does that answer your question?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes. As I understand your statement and as I understand your philosophy about this, it boils down to the recognition of the need to apply the technology which is available to us today which is not being used, and which could be done easily. You did, in fact, make a point about shovels and rakes and I quite agree with you, but I think that as we overcome those basic problems which can