

However, there can be some question as to whether these programs are being adequately implemented. As discussed earlier the formula for allocation of construction funds to the States leaves something to be desired insofar as matching available money to needs.

Any decision to increase the grants substantially should undoubtedly be preceded by an objective analysis of the impact of past grants upon both the rate of correction and the absolute amount of construction compared with previous years.

Concerning grants-in-aid to States for improvement of administration it would be desirable for the Federal authorities in consultation with the States to undertake an evaluation of the use and effectiveness of these expenditures. Where are such funds being channeled: Into research? Into river quality monitoring? For the employment of inspectors? For the conduct of public education programs? For the purchase of laboratory equipment?

Choices for the use of these funds are rather bewildering. Conditions in each State agency will differ regarding matters that should command priority. On the basis of 8 years of experience among so many agencies undoubtedly there are some common denominators for guidance in making choices.

For example, what has been the nature and scope of State research efforts and how productive has this been in realization of the objectives of the agency? Some observers express the view that, if a State agency is already laboring to keep abreast of its regulatory functions, it is folly to invite the diversion of manpower and funds for research.

From an historical standpoint the use of grants-in-aid is regarded as one of the most effective devices available to a central government for stimulating better performance on the part of State and local levels of government. What needs to be examined is whether current implementation of this principle as applied to the administration of State water pollution control programs is effectively oriented.

National policy is also committed to the principle that Federal responsibility embraces the conduct of research and technical training. Such activities have now proliferated to the point where current appropriations (fiscal 1966) total \$15,900,000—an increase of 44 percent over the year preceding. This is in addition to more than \$9 million allocated for extramural research and training grants. These substantial and increasing expenditures lay claim to the establishment of guidelines by which their validity may be examined and justified.

HOW CLEAN SHOULD A STREAM BE?

Thirty years of debate on national policy relating to pollution control—from which Federal legislation, thrice amended, has evolved—has not been distinguished in providing a practical definition of the goal to be sought. The unresolved question is: How clean should a stream be?

This matter dominated deliberations at the 1960 White House Conference on Water Pollution and produced contradictory recommendations. The first asserted that "users of public waters have a responsibility of returning them as nearly clean as is technically possible." This was followed by the declaration that—

There is need for a more systematic approach to the evaluation of the water pollution problems to include health, aesthetic and market values. A framework