

Taken together the State and Federal grants in New York State are intended to defray up to 60 percent of the cost of local projects. The estimated cost of the 6-year program is \$1.7 billion.

While there have been doubts that communities are incapable of financing sewage disposal requirements (for example, using revenue bonds retired from sewer service charges), the principle is now well established that a substantial share of this burden should be carried by the Federal Government. And it appears to be only a matter of time before similar convictions will arise with respect to supplemental funds from the State. All of this has evolved without any documentation anywhere to demonstrate capacity or inability to pay via local service charges.

Disposition of Federal funds.—With respect to Federal expenditures for implementing the Water Pollution Control Act two key issues may be identified: (1) How much money should be appropriated; and (2) for what specific purposes shall it be allocated?

In discussing these issues an examination of the appropriations for fiscal 1966 is illuminating. Here we find that \$91 million is allocated for construction grants, an increase of only 1 percent over the previous budget. For all other purposes (planning, research, enforcement, training, etc.), the operating budget is \$44.5 million, an increase of 27 percent over last year.

If the national goal is to expedite the abatement of pollution—and a major route to accomplish this is by constructing adequate control facilities at sources of pollution—then it would appear that the Federal amounts allocated for this purpose are out of balance with the funds made available for Federal administration. And if budget allocations and percentage increases may be regarded as appropriate criteria of where emphasis is being placed, it would appear that construction funds hardly ranked in importance with the emphasis placed on research, planning, and administration.

Another aspect of budgetary decision that claims scrutiny is the relative weighing accorded to appropriations for Federal enforcement with those allocated for strengthening State administration of control. Here we find \$4 million for Federal activities. However, only \$5 million is earmarked for distribution among 54 State and territorial agencies and 8 interstate agencies. Incidentally, it might also be noted that while funds for Federal enforcement activities were increased 8 percent, there was no increase in the total allotment for the States. Among the conclusions that might be drawn is that Federal money is being harbored to broaden Federal control at the expense of strengthening the role of the States. This, of course, is contrary to the expressed declaration of the act.

Construction grants program.—The adoption of grants-in-aid may be regarded as an acknowledgment that Federal enforcement action could not be any more effective than State efforts in obtaining municipal compliance unless it was accompanied by infusions of financial subsidy. This is a point to be kept in mind when assessments are made of the relative merits of Federal versus State performance in dealing with the complexities of stream pollution.

Lacking the sugar of subsidy to sweeten public attitudes toward compliance the evidence suggests that during the first 8 years of its trial the Federal impact added little to what was already being accomplished by many of the States.