

were particularly concerned about abandoned mines where the present owners had no responsibility. The idea of study and demonstration projects is good if it leads to some actual cleanup work. States should be willing to pay a part of the costs even for demonstration projects and 25% seems like a fair amount.

Oil pollution control

Oil pollution is extremely detrimental to fish and wildlife. Waterfowl in particular have been harmed by oil spills. Many instances of oil spillage have been intentional or the result of carelessness or negligence and a law "with teeth in it" to discourage such waste is needed.

"Acts of God" should not absolve vessels or installations of all responsibility for their accidents. We need a national plan for dealing with such emergencies near our coast lines and on our navigable waters.

The idea of a revolving fund to finance cleanup activities might work but it also could be a limiting factor on how much could be done even in an emergency. Earmarking of funds might assure some money but it could be insufficient when the need is greatest.

In Section 19(h), I wonder why the Secretary should be authorized to issue regulations permitting the discharge of oil? But, I presume it is necessary to delineate maximum tolerances as a matter of practicality.

The provision on federal agency responsibility is good as the government should "get its own house in order" before getting tough with others.

H.R. 15906

Oil and hazardous substances pollution control

This bill is practically the same as S. 2760 with respect to oil pollution. One improvement is the section dealing with "other matter" which may constitute an imminent or substantial hazard to public health or welfare.

Enforcement provisions seem to be stronger and perhaps better.

The Section requiring the Secretary to establish water quality and conservative objectives and standards on removing oil discharges seems very desirable.

H.R. 15906 is preferable to S. 2760 on oil pollution but it still doesn't provide for accidental spills which could be the most damaging of all.

H.R. 15907

Waste treatment works debt financing

This is a major piece of legislation on many aspects of water pollution control. It duplicates parts of other bills and substantially amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Its major feature is the change in federal procedure of financing municipal treatment plants. It seems practical as this is how modern day financing is done and should stimulate greater municipal action. Three years should prove it either valuable or unworkable.

I like the guidelines in Section (f) (2), that (1) there be reasonable assurance of repayment, (2) that there is enough money available to do the job, and (3) the obligation bears a reasonable interest rate.

As a tax payer I agree that interest on obligations for waste treatment installations, financed partly by federal money, should not be tax exempt, but this may slow down sale of bonds. Federal guarantee of loans, however, should make them attractive.

Other provisions of H.R. 15907 should encourage better regional watershed and large metropolitan area planning. We have attempted to do the pollution control job piecemeal for too long. Requirements for 125,000 person units, comprehensive planning and pay-as-you-go financing should speed up sewage treatment development. By all means every approved project should have state approval, conform to better quality standards, meet overall state needs, cover a maximum feasible area and be consistent with a river basin pollution control plan if there is one.

The 10% limitation of fund allotment to any one state should help distribute the federal money, but there should continue to be some additional incentive to the state that is doing the most for itself. I am glad to see the emphasis on adequacy of design and encouragement of statewide planning.

The authorizing amounts for construction grants are much more realistic than appropriations have been in recent years. I do not know if they are ade-