

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH,
AND DEVELOPMENT BY BURR ALLEGAERT, INTERNATIONAL PIPE &
CERAMICS CORP., AUGUST 8, 1966

Knowing of the current hearings being conducted by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development into the adequacy of technology for pollution abatement, we should like to bring to the committee's attention for inclusion in the record certain brief excerpts on this subject from a recent special issue of the Interpace Technical Journal.

International Pipe & Ceramics Corp., of Parsippany, N.J., publisher of this periodical, invited leading authorities to write on several aspects of the overall water resources development and pollution abatement problems.

We feel that the following passages are especially pertinent:

John E. Kinney, sanitary engineering consultant, Ann Arbor, Mich.:

Questions such as "What is the best way of augmenting our present municipal water source?" "How must we organize our pollution control administration?" "What is pollution?" demand specific and detailed answers for each individual situation. Slogans will not substitute for sound judgment, nor will mass misunderstanding bring about rational results.

But research for adequate and valid data is forgotten when a proposal is being argued in the public forum. Details become unimportant because of the gravity of the issue. Even basic circumstances are lost sight of, such as the principal fact that we are not running out of water. We have, at best estimates, underground water at shallow depth equivalent to 34 times the annual runoff from all our rivers. There is probably an equal volume in deep storage.

The "running out of water" hysteria is nurtured by the assertions that while our present water consumption is 300 billion gallons per day, it will rise by 1980 to 600 billion gallons per day, and that our potential total supply is only 515 billion gallons per day. Doubling our usage in 15 years is an optimistic forecast of growth, to say the least, but it permits the forecast of a national shortage. This deficit prompts the gloomy prophecy that we must resign ourselves to a future of existing on "used" water.

The fallacy is twofold:

Water used is not water consumed. Of the 300 billion gallons per day now used, only about 60 is consumed [not available for reuse]. Most of this loss is via agriculture.

We are now reusing water. In fact, we are now using the same water as was used in Biblical times. And in areas such as the Cuyahoga, the Mahoning, and the Monongahela Rivers, we are pumping several times as much water as is carried by the river during dry weather. If that is not enough to destroy the myth, we now use 2,000 billion gallons per day for hydroelectric generation—four times our estimated future potential supply.

James F. Wright, executive director, Delaware River Basin Commission, Trenton, N.J.:

Let us now consider some similarities and differences between industrial and municipal wastes, which together comprise our water quality management problem. From this we may be able to guess where we will be going in the next decade.

In terms of volume, the industrial waste input in the Delaware estuary—from Trenton to the sea—is roughly equal to the load imposed by municipalities. This means that probably for the foreseeable future reductions of the industrial waste load will take at least as much effort as municipal control.