

When you are in the wet cycle, which I have lived through on the Great Lakes, everybody wanted less water because you were flooding out harbors and recreational areas.

The Corps is reviewing this now, for the next 2 to 3 years, to determine how one extricates oneself hydrologically from the dilemmas created by the natural cycles, moving from high floodwater runoffs for a long period of time and then such a period as we have gone through from 1962-65. It is going to be very interesting to see what in general may be suggested.

Mr. MOSHER. I have a constituent who argues that there is a need for much greater control at the point where the water runs out.

Dr. WOLMAN. At the lower ends?

Mr. MOSHER. At the lower end; yes.

Dr. WOLMAN. Now there are differences of opinion where you would do it, whether you would do it upstream or downstream, running all the way from Superior and St. Clair and Erie and down the river.

Mr. MOSHER. Are there studies available on the possibility of controlling the downstream flow?

Dr. WOLMAN. Yes. Now these need to be looked at seriously enough in relation to the problem that we are talking about; namely, of trying to recapture not only Erie but to avoid the degradation of Lake Michigan.

Here again you have competitive forces, and you want to return to Lake Michigan for only a moment. You have the recent Supreme Court hearings—by recent, they have been going on for the last 5 years, and ultimately will reach Congress. But they have a competition which is not easily resolvable, where the people objecting to diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois River, want the waste discharges (with treatment) of the Chicago metropolitan area to go back into the lake.

This is interesting, as to that particular group. I am not passing on the relative merits of either, because the case isn't closed yet. But their insistence is that you should not divert that amount of liquid into the Illinois, because it ought to stay in the Michigan.

The people in the Chicago area who oppose this say "Well, now, look, what are you doing, you are going to increase tremendously the aging of Lake Michigan because you will be turning back tremendous amounts of organic materials, tremendous amounts of nitrogen or phosphorus, or you will have to take them all out at tremendous cost."

This issue is one that remains and it is an issue which I do not believe we can escape, no matter what the fiat may be. It will have to be resolved. It is another example where your general total uses have no compatibilities. The decision finally has to be made either by the courts or by your policymakers, either by Congress or by your basin river authorities, as to which one you choose to do. It is not that you choose to degrade it or to lift it up, but you are really making a choice as between functional uses of your water resource. We need to be reminded that those choices are inescapable in a country that is rapidly approaching 200 million people and all the activity that goes with it.

I might say that having the 200 million people is not an unmixed blessing from the standpoint of my professional operations, but they are there, and they do manufacture, and they do produce, and they