Mr. MOSHER. I doubt that many people would disagree with what you are saying, and yet certainly the ultimate quality of the water is what we are primarily interested in.

This may be a philosophical matter which the Congress may ultimately have to consider. You are probably saying that quality standards can be adjusted from stream to stream and one body of water to another, depending on the public interest in those particular streams and the uses to which those streams are to be put.

Mr. WILKENFELD. Mind you, there is one thing we have to recognize: There are certain minimum base-level quality requirements that all streams must meet. At least the industry feels this way, and I'm sure the public agencies do too. And this is the protection of health, the avoidance of obvious nuisances, the degradation of aesthetics severely. These things must be protected on all streams as a minimum. Then how far beyond that you want to go will depend on the best interest of the community, and in many cases should be decided by the people themselves as it has been in the past.

Mr. MOSHER. I think it would be impossible for the Federal Government to set a single standard for every stream because obviously the flow and the volume of water and the nature of the fields and foliage and everything else along the stream is an influencing factor.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. The other factor which is incapable of control is what other plants are discharging along that stream. So why not attack the discharge itself and then we eliminate this other problem of determining the quality of the stream?

Mr. WILKENFELD. This is exactly the role of Government in determining what quality level should be maintained in the stream, assessing how much should be put in and how this should be parceled out among the various contributors; it is a very difficult question.

Mr. RYAN. And it could require an interstate system to do this?

Mr. WILKENFELD. It could, and this is why we think the systems approach should be considered here, because it is so complex and must weigh in so many different factors.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Logan, I would like to know if the problem of your industry isn't probably inorganic waste? Certainly the organic part of your waste is readily controllable, as organic waste generally is, but don't we have some very serious special problems of inorganic waste with respect to your industry in particular?

Mr. LOGAN. I think we have some problems of inorganic wastes, yes. The organic chemical part of the industry has grown at a much faster pace than the inorganic, and I think there are problems in the organic area.

We have had the detergent problem, and basically the detergent problem was related to organic compounds.

I will defer to one of my technical experts to make a comparison, but I feel there are problems in both areas of the industry, Mr. Conable.

Mr. CONABLE. Are we making any progress in the inorganic field? A lot of the testimony here before this committee has been to the effect that it is possible to control the disposal of human waste by tertiary means. But have there been successful attempts to eliminate the inorganic chemicals, the phosphates, and so forth?