

Mr. FULTON. I believe we have to watch that we keep the language so that the average person, such as we, Congressmen, can understand it. When you, Dr. Weinberger and your fellow scientists, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. Daddario, use words like eutrophication, wouldn't it be better just to call it clogging a lake through overenrichment? When I hear the word "eutrophication" I wonder whether it is building up or down, making hotter or colder. You see, I cannot tell just from the word what it means. I would imagine most of the people in the audience cannot.

Mr. DADDARIO. Doctor, the reason I put that word into my opening statement this morning was to see if I could get a reaction from Mr. Fulton. It was sort of a trap. The other day when that same word came up he went into the very root of it for some 5 or 10 minutes and I thought that he made a very good case. So I used it this morning.

Mr. FULTON. Having gone to Harvard, it gets to be difficult at times when they throw things out like that. I wrestled with them like a dog.

Dr. Weinberger, I was very intrigued by your extra "D" in R.D. & D. I must say I had hoped you would get better results from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration because there you only have one "D." So could I make a suggestion to the Department that they correct that and give you the extra "D." You seem to want it.

I could point out to you that Abraham Lincoln had a story about Mary Todd, his fiance, later Mary Todd Lincoln. He said to her one time in an argument that actually while she had two "d's" in "Todd," God, for a long time, had been satisfied with one. So I hope you will be satisfied with one "D."

Mr. DADDARIO. We could carry that a step further, following Mr. Fulton's story: The "D" could be classified under "Divinity."

Seriously, however, a recent ruling of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals stated that the Federal Power Commission should not have licensed Consolidated Edison to build a Storm King Mountain plant without considering the total environmental impact, esthetic tranquility, et cetera. Do you know of any similar rulings? Are we now able to provide regulatory agencies with useful environmental information so that such determinations could be made? What implications, particularly in consideration of what Mr. Fulton said about taking a look at the whole thing, do you see in decisions of this kind which do include tranquility and esthetics?

Dr. WEINBERGER. Mr. Chairman, quite a bit of that information is available. We obviously need more. When the water quality standards program was established by the Congress we called together a group of experts to help us establish the criteria by which we could assess the various water uses.

The various water uses include not only municipal use, industrial, agricultural, propagation of fish and other aquatic life, but also water for esthetic purposes. These consultants, and I believe they were some 80 in number, reviewed the kinds of water that it would be desirable to have to protect all of these values. This has been issued in a report. I have a copy of it. I would be pleased to get copies to the members. It represents a rather thick document.

Mr. DADDARIO. This document which I now show you?