in another case it would be technically and economically impossible to comply, and hence that operation would be required to be shut down with consequent economic effect on the whole area.

Mr. MOSHER. Yet, from the public interest standpoint, it might be argued that it is important that the quality of the water in your river as compared to the Ohio River should be essentially the same.

Mr. LOGAN. Well, I think it is a matter of public interest, and I am perfectly willing to let the public decide. That is what we are saying. In the case of the operation on the Holston River, maybe the public would decide that it was in their interest to continue the operation of the plant. This is one of the complexities that I referred to that probably has to be subjected to a rather broad scale systems analysis to take into account factors other than mere discharge problems.

Mr. RYAN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSHER. Yes.

Mr. RYAN. If each plant, wherever it was located, was required to apply the same methods to handle the pollution, why would there be a competitive disadvantage?

Mr. LOGAN. As a matter of fact, each plant is applying essentially the same disposal techniques today.

Mr. MOSHER. But the result is different.

Mr. RYAN. I understand that. But suppose you did not have the water in which to discharge it?

Mr. LOGAN. Based on the present status of technology and the economics associated therewith, the plant would shut down. This conclusion has been stated in hearing reports that have covered this subject over a number of years.

Mr. WILKENFELD. There are two points under consideration here, and I think it would be well if we recognize these. One is basing control on the quality requirement in the stream itself, and the other is basing control on effluent quality requirement, and this sometimes gets confused in discussions such as this.

If the water usage of the stream is such and the waterflow in the stream is such that they are comparable, then the quality requirements in the stream should be the same. I don't think anyone questions this. On the other hand, if the volume of water available to carry the discharges away and/or the usages of the stream differ, there is no reason why the discharge quality should have to be the same.

Now why put both companies on an equal economic footing? In a competitive economy no two plants are ever on the same footing. One has different wage scales; one has slightly different distribution costs; the cost of bringing in equipment may vary. All sorts of factors enter into it, including the differences in the processes themselves.

So I don't think we have every attempted in the United States to make sure everybody spends exactly the same amount of money to produce something, and I don't think any two producers ever do.

You will find that profit margins vary between companies and I find it hard to see why in pollution abatement everyone should suddenly pay the exact same amount of money for treatment. This means that everybody would have to be on the lowest possible basis of discharge to take into account the man on the smaller stream, and can only result in increases in costs beyond that that is required.