

water resources. Your role, Mr. Chairman, and that of this committee, reaches back to the origins of the national water pollution control program. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which became permanent law in 1956, and the strengthening amendments of 1961, 1965, and 1966, are in no small measure the products of your deliberations.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 provided new and expanded authorities for an all-out assault on the pollution of our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. But the enormity and the complexity of the water pollution problem, and the heavy demands on the Federal budget, deny us a period of consolidation, devoted to the effective implementation of our enlarged responsibilities. Conditions call for further legislation. The law must be sufficient to the task.

You have before you major clean water legislation proposed by the Administration: the "Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968" (H. R. 15907), the "Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Control Act of 1968" (H. R. 15906 and identical bills), and legislation to control pollution from vessels within the navigable waters of the United States (H. R. 13923 and H. R. 16207). Additionally, we urge the enactment of S. 2760, already passed by the Senate, which deals with important aspects of the oil pollution problem, as well as with lake eutrophication and acid and other mine water pollution.

I have already conveyed to Congress by letter the Administration's support of these proposed amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Each is addressed to one or more parts of the total water pollution problem.

Today I want to discuss the need for: (1) Federal assistance to construct waste treatment works by a method which supplements the present grant program; (2) more effective means to cope with pollution by oil and other hazardous substances; (3) a program for the control of pollution from vessels; and (4) legislation to control pollution of lakes and to control pollution from acid and other mine drainage.

THE "WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1968"

No conservation measure before Congress today is more important, in my judgment than this bill, introduced in the House as H. R. 15907.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 called for the establishment of enforceable State water quality standards on all interstate and coastal waters. Over half the State standards have now been approved. The rest will soon be approved.

These standards include implementation plans which call for the construction of needed waste treatment works on a timely basis. But these works will cost money—large sums of money. The recent Interior report, "The Cost of Clean Water," states that the "cost of constructing municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor sewers is estimated at \$8.0 billion, exclusive of land and associated costs" over the next five years. We have some indications that these initial estimates may be conservative. Whatever these costs finally turn out to be, the fact remains that these facilities will be needed or communities will not meet the schedules of the water quality standards and will face State and Federal enforcement actions. One can readily see that, to implement the water quality standards program on the basis of the schedules contained in the State standards which have been approved, there is an urgent need to provide adequate funds to finance the municipal construction phase of the standards program. The Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968 is the cornerstone of this program.

In enacting the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, Congress unanimously authorized \$3.4 billion for grants for municipal waste treatment plants for fiscal years 1968-1971. \$203 million was appropriated this fiscal year, compared with an authorization of \$450 million. The President's budget for the next fiscal year contains \$225 million, compared to \$700 million authorized.

The Administration believes that the Federal Government is committed to help localities meet large water pollution expenditures now. H.R. 15907 will enable us to commit the full \$700 million authorized for fiscal year 1969.

Instead of the program's being funded entirely by direct grants, as is now the case, we are proposing that there be added to the existing program a contract approach aimed primarily at the larger urban areas.

Specifically:

1. The bill would authorize long-term contracts—up to 30 years—with States and local public bodies. These contracts could be initiated once a level of contractual authority is established in an Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1969.