

selves pioneers in this field. Now in its twelfth edition, our "Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater" is as much of an outstanding contribution to the public's health today as it was when first published in 1905.

Within the past fifteen years, APHA has reinforced its support for State water pollution control programs. In 1955 we urged Federal legislation to provide additional research on water pollution problems; in 1957 APHA endorsed the approved amendments to Public Law 660; in 1959 we advised the strengthening of water pollution control measures within the Public Health Service. To trace APHA's concern with water pollution is also to discover our dismay with the slow progress in solving this health problem.

In 1966 we strongly opposed the transfer of water pollution control authority from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of the Interior. We expressed our belief that this substitution served no constructive purpose and would only result in the mere shifting of health experts into the ranks of the new administering agency. In passing, we should like to note that the monumental achievements promised at the time of this transfer of authority are yet to be attained.

The present amendment in question, H.R. 15907, has raised some concern on the part of APHA. We have always maintained that to be effective, water pollution control must be carried out at State and local levels. This would be accomplished with as much organizational latitude as possible. We believed then, and still do now, that planning, development and control ought to be aimed at promoting local initiative. The guidelines laid down by the original Water Pollution Control Act supported this concept. However, segments of the current amendment to this Act seem to contradict the very idea of local self-sufficiency. In particular, we refer to the proposed tax on municipal bonds which would finance construction of sewage treatment facilities. Tax exemption has traditionally served as an incentive for investment in local public works. It is difficult to perceive just how the concept of a State-Federal partnership could survive if a municipal bond tax were implemented. Such a proposal would run directly counter to the intent of the original Act and would penalize rather than stimulate local investment in vital public works projects.

Another problem arising out of this amendment is the possibility that Federal reimbursement of local funds would no longer be authorized. Congress, in 1966, approved the pre-financing provision, thus rewarding the initiative of those States which began worthwhile projects prior to Federal approval. As with the plan for taxing municipal bonds, the concept of a Federal-State partnership would be jeopardized if the prefinancing provisions were deleted from the proposed amendment.

The APHA cannot emphasize enough the pressing need for a more expedient and effective means to eliminate polluting effluents in our nation's water supply. Progress can be made in this direction only if the Federal Government is responsive to the States in their campaigns against water pollution. Consequently, we would oppose any proposals which retard progress in this area.

Sincerely yours,

BERWYN F. MATTISON, M.D.,
Executive Director.

STATE OF MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES,
April 26, 1968.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
*Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FALLON: Please accept my views concerning H.R. 16044 which would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize grants for assisting in improved operation of waste treatment plants.

The bill with certain modifications would assist Maryland's water pollution control program. In the past I have supported the wisdom of Federal and State grants to assist in the initial construction of main sewerage facilities. But it has seemed to me that the cost of maintenance and operation could be assessed against those served through appropriate user charges. However, in many instances, the requirements of high water quality standards designed to enhance water uses many miles from the point of discharge cause a substantial increase in the cost