We have monitoring programs that are aimed at detecting the levels that are now present; we have regulations that prohibit shipment of these interstate if they have any substantial levels and so on.

But, again, one other point that this opens up, and that I might have commented on, is that a great deal of our work in pollution or in relation to pesticides has really been aimed at sort of stating how bad the situation is. It seems to me that this is the wrong point of view.

Rather, what we really need to know, because surely we are going to have some levels of pollutants in the environment, are what levels we can have without detriment to the environment. The research may be done in the same way, but the results will be much more useful to us, in fact, if they are phrased in such a way that they tell us that this is allowable and that it will have no effect insofar as we can judge now, rather than the other way around.

Mr. DADDARIO. So, you need to have a better idea of what you must accomplish.

Dr. BUCKLEY. Yes; it seems too much effort up until now has been in trying to demonstrate to people such as you and to the general public and me that there is really a valid problem that we ought to be concerned about.

Shucks, I'm convinced. What I want to know is, "What are we going to do about this problem?" We are going to have wastes of some sort or another, and we are going to have to segregate these into some part of the environment where they won't be disadvantageous to us. We need to have sufficient knowledge that we can do this without damage—so we can have our cake and eat it, too.

We may use the oceans to dispose of some of these wastes. In a natural world, they were sinks—almost everything eventually ran into the oceans. Today we tend to treat them as though they would do this for all sorts of artificial products as well as natural ones, and no doubt, with sufficient knowledge, we can afford to use them deliberately for this purpose. But even the oceans are not inexhaustible resources, and do not have a capacity to absorb unlimited quantities of wastes. And the difficulty is intensified because we usually place these waste materials in fairly localized areas, usually quite close to shore where they are subject to recycling.

This suggests to me that in the estuaries we may need to come around soon to a kind of landscaping zoning, a decision that for the estuaries the principle of multiple use won't work.

An estuary can be used either for this purpose or for something else. Carrying it to an extreme, clearly if one dredges and builds industrial sites, this is one valuable use for an estuary. At the same time, you can't expect the shallow waters along the edge of it to serve as a nursery ground for shrimp and other aquatic resources.

This is a choice that you have to make and it seems to me that a zoning concept is the way to make it.

Can we afford to fill or pollute all of them since they are so very important to us in terms of marine products? I don't think we can. At the moment, there isn't any way of saying that you can't do it to this estuary but it is all right to do it to that one.

Mr. DADDARIO. Do we have enough ecologists available to make a solid beginning in this area? If we don't, how do we get them?