

lion, the budget request, as compared to an authorization of \$450 million. The fiscal year 1969 budget request is \$225 million, as compared to the authorized amount of \$700 million.

What this means for California is that the State's share of the Federal grant money will be substantially reduced. California's prospective allocation under the full authorization, \$35,278,600, was reduced to \$13,912,000 under the current appropriation—less than 40 percent of the amount we had hoped to receive. In fiscal year 1969, California will be eligible for only \$15,814,200 under the President's budget request, as compared to the \$56,895,300 we could have received under the full authorization.

In my own Second Congressional District, the need for funds for waste treatment works construction continues, in part, because of the lack of Federal money. As of March 31 of this year, there were a total of 17 Second District projects pending which totaled over \$16 million in eligible costs and for which more than \$5 million is requested in Federal funds.

The nationwide program will lose the momentum we have generated if waste treatment plant funding is not intensified. It is for this reason that I support the enactment of the "Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968" which provides for an alternate approach to financing the Federal share of the cost of constructive waste treatment works. Under this approach, the Federal Government could enter into long-term contract commitments to make principal and interest payments to State and local bodies or their designees to meet the construction costs of these plants.

The Second District of California had received, as of March 31, 1968, Federal grant assistance totaling \$5,123,598 to aid in construction of 30 projects costing a total of \$17,814,051 (eligible costs). In addition to the financial assistance provided to the Second District by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, we have also received financial aid for waste treatment facilities from the Department of Agriculture's program of assistance to rural areas (Farmer's Home Administration) and the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce.

Last month, the mammoth oil spill from the tanker OCEAN EAGLE, in San Juan Bay, Puerto Rico, served to dramatize once again the need for the Congress to take immediate action to protect our waters and shorelines from devastating oil discharges. This accident occurred off the coast of Puerto Rico. Our own California coastline is by no means free from the threat of damage by oil. In a recent year (1966), there were 58 reported oil spills from vessels, shore installations, and unknown sources in San Francisco Bay. For the same year, 175 such spills were reported for the Los Angeles-Long Beach area, and 125 for San Diego Bay. Although none of these spills reached the huge proportions of the Puerto Rican spill this March, they have caused immeasurable damage to the precious estuarine and coastal areas of California. Our coastal areas and waterways also need protection from hazardous substances other than oil—chemicals, industrial wastes, fly ash, and other harmful pollutant—which may be discharged accidentally or otherwise and may inflict severe damages to shorelines and other property.

The "Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Control Act of 1968" is an outgrowth of the joint Interior-Transportation report to the President on their study of pollution by oil and other harmful substances. The legislation is designed to carry out many of the report's recommendations. It would extend the area in which the discharge of oil would be prohibited to the waters of the contiguous zone and would provide for the cleanup and would provide for the cleanup of large discharges of other pollutants. This Act directly complements the oil pollution provisions of S. 2760, and similar legislation sponsored in the House of Representatives, which greatly enhance the enforcement authority of the Federal Government and give the Secretary of the Interior added cleanup authority once a spill has occurred.

S. 2760 would also further our present efforts to develop techniques for the effective control and elimination of acid and other mine water pollution. I heartily endorse favorable action on these bills.

Wastes from watercraft and related facilities are a serious form of water pollution, not yet properly controlled by existing law. Legislation pending before this Committee will take important steps to control pollution from these vessel sources, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set standards for the sewage discharged from boats in navigable United States waters.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the hearings held by this committee during these next three days will focus attention on the seriousness of the water pollution problem that faces our Nation today, and the importance