

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

MR. PENFOLD. Mr. Chairman, I am J. W. Penfold of the Izaak Walton League. The league has been organized for nearly 50 years, and its major interest throughout the years has been water pollution.

One recent effort of ours is this little booklet, "Clean Water," which was produced with the help of the other major conservation organizations, and is in the process now of distribution across the country. I gave a supply to the committee yesterday, in case any of the members wanted to have a look at it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about a couple of items in which all of the conservationists are interested.

First of all, research.

It seems to us, Mr. Chairman, that the restructuring of section 6, while making no substantive changes, points up the growing emphasis on research and related activities and on systematic and prompt dissemination of research findings and data.

We agree that there should be this emphasis. There is no question but that the country should accelerate its efforts to discover and develop improved methods to measure the effects to discover and develop improved methods to measure the effects of pollutants on water uses and to develop better systems for treating sewage and other water-borne wastes to remove maximum possible amounts of physical, chemical, and biological pollutants.

We have but one fear, and it is an old fear with which conservationists have had a lot of experience over the years; that is the argument that action to abate pollution, using best present knowledge, be delayed until some time later when some research has been accomplished. The ultimate knowledge will never be achieved, if only because of population growth, increased complexities of society, the goods and services it requires and the creation of more sophisticated wastes.

We support research in all its ramifications, but we do not want the research effort used as an excuse for not doing what science and technology knows how to do today.

One specific illustration of this undesired potential is the use of augmented streamflow to meet water quality standards. Section 6, subsection (a) (6) provides that the Secretary shall develop improved methods "to evaluate the effects on water quality and water uses of augmented streamflows to control water pollution not reasonably susceptible to other means of abatement."

A person need only review the transcripts of State hearings on water quality standards required by the Water Quality Act of 1965 to find endless testimony urging stream flow augmentation as the "practical" alternative to construction of waste treatment facilities. We don't think this is an acceptable or practical alternative. We do agree that the kinds of information such evaluations would provide, in the long run, will be important to sound and effective management of the total water resource. We reject in principle that it be used by anyone to avoid responsibility for his own wastes.

This is clearly a matter of proper administration of the act rather than the language of the bill, Mr. Chairman, but we think it warrants mention before this committee.