

the bottom, and in areas that would be selected so it would be covered, this material could be sealed off for all time, in what they call a sink in the lake.

There is a good deal involved in how this material is transported, where the sites should be. These kinds of considerations should be fully evaluated, rather than merely jump on a bandwagon. To save a lake we argue we cannot do one thing, only to find out, as Mr. Jones pointed out, that we have got a worse problem than we started with.

I strongly urge that this committee gives its consideration to this kind of an approach.

One of the real ironies in this, incidentally, and it is one of the things that galls me, is that this crusade in Chicago was carried on by a newspaper, the Tribune, that owns a paperplant in Canada, the Ontario Paper Co., whose waste is discharged, untreated, under the Wellington Canal, over into the old canal, down through the park of St. Catherine, and out to Lake Ontario, and with no treatment.

It is supposed to have treatment by 1970. They will be lucky if they get it by 1973 or 1974.

This is the paper that would mould American congressional opinion, while destroying Canadian waters. This double standard gives me a pain in the neck; but it is remarkable.

You know, sometimes you begin to wonder whether or not the crusading spirit is promoted by altruistic motives.

RESEARCH

The next area that I would like to mention is that of research. Under H.R. 15907 and S. 3206, three points are covered, three areas.

The first is research. The gentlemen that were just here were promoting more research. I am all for research, but, very frankly, unless we can begin to orient our research, we are more interested in spending money on projects than accomplishing anything.

Mr. Jones will recall that in the course of his hearings around the country, he attempted to determine who was using the results of this sponsored research and had no luck. And the condition is still pretty much the same today.

The proposal in the bill would essentially give the Secretary greater discretion. One of the biggest difficulties we are having today, and I am talking now from the practical viewpoint of dealing with people who have made application for grants, is the number of times that they have to redo their grant applications, the resubmissions—one company I know of claims today they have spent over \$40,000 in trying to get a Federal grant to work on a research program, simply because of the number of trips to Washington, the number of revampings, the number of redos, and this does more to discourage an attitude and leaves an impression that people are not interested.

This committee opened the research program to tie industrial waste treatment in as a part of the picture, and this was most important. Without the industrial picture, you have lost the show.

But unless the money is in a form that is available to be used, we are in a little difficulty, and right now we are in an administrative difficulty that is a dilly. It is one that I would suggest this committee could