

Mr. MOSHER. Dr. Wolman, I think we have to recognize that the success of this compact required a great deal of political effort. I happen to have been in the Ohio Senate at the time Ohio ratified this venture and participated in some of the proceedings. It required a lot of effort on the part of various State legislatures to put this together. For many of the regional compacts which we need, we are going to need a similar amount of political effort.

Dr. WOLMAN. Yes. As you know, having been present at the creation of the Ohio compact and having something to do with its formulation and language, we were perfectly aware of the fact that you are dealing with people, you are dealing with money, and you are dealing incidentally with alternative necessities for money.

Of course, it is interesting and striking in this particular documentation—there is no suggestion on the part of any witness that first of all there is a limitation to money and there is no limitation or necessity for public expenditure. This is one of the problems with which we necessarily always have to deal.

We have again in the total field of our society alternative choices to make. I realize that when we go to our own legislature, for example, which is a party to the Potomac compact, which I would say has even less powers than the Ohio, but does a reasonable job. The legislative assembly asks very promptly what are our commitments to it? Usually, of course, there are two: money, and the conversion of their State power to an external agency. Many of them are very jealous of that.

I cannot say much more on the questions of standards and criteria, excepting to say that if I were to take the Lake Erie area one might very well say that you have two things to do, one of which you are already doing under the Federal impact, and that is establish the standards that you want Lake Erie to have as a receiving body of water. The second is to look hard at whether you want to establish minimum requirements for the waste discharges.

I say look hard at it, because I would not be prepared to say that this is what you would promptly want to do, except on a minimum basis. That you may want to do.

The universalizing over the entire country of the same criteria for waste discharge I think would be a mistake, simply because it is a vast country with a variety of situations, natural and man made.

I think it was Mr. Wagner of TVA who pointed out that there is a tremendous difference between what you should do and can do, maintaining high quality, on the Holston, and what you would do on the Mississippi. Two plants in both instances of similar character and of similar production would not be warranted in exercising exactly the same degree of waste control.

There are many reasons why we would be, in fact, making an uneconomic use of the resources of the country. My own inclination is that we use those resources, again, as wisely as we know how, rather than normalizing them.

These efforts to have what was called the postage stamp idea for all criteria is not tenable. There is a difference after all between the deep harbor off of Seattle and the nonexistent harbor off of Spokane. We do not wipe out easily these natural differences by simply saying all of them should be alike.