provision and proper operation of the facilities for accomplishing these objectives. It recognizes that these efforts include research, planning, regulation, as well as the formal and informal instruction of those working in the field.

The federation has a worldwide reputation as the primary disseminator of technical information in the field through its periodicals and special publications.

The federation's statement of policy last approved by the board of control during its annual conference in October 1967 is appended and made a part of this statement. Even a cursory view will indicate the federation's deep concern with the proper approach to water pollution control problems.

This statement is directed toward certain of the bills before the committee as follows:

THE "WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1968"—H.R. 15907

This bill makes a frontal attack on the inadequacies of the present Federal Water Pollution Control program. Even though the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 provided for a productive program, the financial support for that program has not been forthcoming and has reduced the rate of municipal water pollution control plant construction much below that anticipated by the act. H.R. 15907 aims to correct this deficiency by longtime Federal financing of the Federal Government's share to overcome the current restrictions on the financial support essential to the success of the program.

In deleting the reimbursement part of the construction financing in the 1966 act, it is apparent that the present bill creates a hardship on those communities that have proceeded under the promise of reimbursement. Other communities that have been encouraged to proceed would then be confused further. These uncertainties and changes would add to the overall tendency toward retarding the program instead of providing acceleration.

Some of the provisions of this bill fit into the existing framework of financing. For example, charges made to the users of a treatment works have been established by many communities, including that authorized by the Congress in 1954 for the District of Columbia. Such service charges have been found to place the treatment facilities on a utility financing basis, providing funds not only for necessary capital improvements but also for proper operation and maintenance of the system. This is sound financing and it is helping many cities and sanitary authorities provide proper drainage service for their citizens. It is emphasized that there are other sound and well-established methods of local financing. It also is pointed out that it is desirable for local financing methods to continue to be choices of each municipality.

While municipal bonds relieved of their tax-exempt status may be responsible for a higher repayment cost to the municipality, the faith and credit of the Federal Government will tend to offset this, and, hopefully, the final result will not be more expensive to the municipality. However, it seems to reduce greatly the possibility of accelerating construction rates of water pollution control works, and could be another factor contributing to a retarded construction rate. It would seem well to consider the removal of these provisions and leave such a basic change to tax legislation.