

ernment should provide the leadership, should be out in front, and should serve as a model as to how remedial action at these installations can be accomplished. To say there is no money available is to beg the question. We do not accept this reason from commercial polluters. We say simply that the health and well-being of the community demand pollution abatement. It occurs to us that agencies are playing a close game, as the committees in the Congress I am sure know better than do we. The way in which budget requests are presented to the Congress may have a great deal to do with whether appropriations are available to carry out the pollution abatement program. We are also aware of Executive Order 11288, entitled "Prevention, Control and Abatement of Water Pollution by Federal Activities", which was signed by the President on July 2, 1966. The language of the Executive Order is crisp, the direction is clear, but alas, the results have not followed. When one places in a budget a line item for pollution abatement facilities he is perfectly aware that when it becomes appropriate for budgets to be cut this item will be a sitting duck.

On February 23, 1965 the Special Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate held hearings on Federal Installations, Facilities and Equipment Control Act. On page 43 of these hearings, a brief colloquy between the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator Edmund Muskie and Mr. John C. Bryson, a Director of the Delaware Water Pollution Commission, is reported. Senator Muskie inquired:

"Mr. Bryson, in your prepared statement you made a point I think we should emphasize; that is that these agencies are primarily concerned with their principal mission, not with pollution treatment, so that in their budget presentations they are concerned in the Department of Defense, for example, primarily with requesting the dollars necessary to carry out their primary mission, and so understandably in their presentation to the Budget Bureau, to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, they are likely to emphasize their primary mission and not this one, and if dollars have to be saved this is where dollars are likely to be saved. Is that your analysis of what happens?"

Mr. Bryson: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Chairman, we do not pretend to know the precise vehicle by which the rather broad, varied and often disconnected elements of the Bureaus of the Federal Government can be controlled as to pollution. We do feel that a reappraisal on the part of the Committee is going to have to take shape, not only for the intrinsic value of clean up alone but for the example that is being set to the States in their water pollution control enforcement actions and to those involved in municipal or commercial pollution. Unless something is done regarding the Federal installations it will stand as a monument to the inability of the Federal Government to clean up pollution that has been occasioned by its own actions.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to thank you and members of the Committee for giving us the opportunity to present our views in these most important areas of water pollution control and abatement. Thank you.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the last point you make certainly is a very valid one, because it is obvious that we cannot without integrity and forcefulness enforce these laws on commercial and municipal polluters if the Federal Government itself is not putting its own house in order.

Dr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, any inquiries you wish to make to the gentlemen here who constitute the panel, I am sure they will be very happy to respond.

RESPONSIBILITY IN OIL POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. McCARTHY. There was one point that emerged in this morning's hearings that I wonder if any of you gentlemen have any suggestions about. This concerns oil pollution, and it was brought out by the representatives of the maritime unions that the Senate bill was rather harsh in proposing to impose rather severe penalties, including imprisonment, for discharges of oil.