

The thoughts presented in this paper hopefully will serve to stimulate state officials to take a fresh and strong approach in their relationships with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and to encourage a review of the legal aspects of any standards, agreements and programs which have been accepted by the Secretary or proposed for his consideration. The Congress and the state legislatures have entrusted the primary responsibility for an effective pollution control program to the state agencies and nothing should be permitted to disrupt or deter it. The states will be required to enforce and administer the standards, not the federal government. The states are in the front ranks in the battle for clean water. They are the ones who must tell local industries, municipalities and citizens they must comply with these standards. So they must be certain they can enforce their pollution control programs.

Mr. KINNEY. Also, and along this same line, if I understood Mr. Penfold correctly, his statement was that the Federal agency has no authority over thermal pollution. I would suggest that somebody is missing a cue somewhere, because the thermal control units are probably the most discussed individual limits of any among the States and the Federal Government.

In other words, the authority is there, or they otherwise could not be contesting it.

Also, I find nothing in the law that excludes or limits any particular injurious effect. They are all included. Insofar as I can see, if I understood Mr. Penfold correctly, somebody has been giving him a song and dance. But it does bring to the point the desirability of having a better understanding of the policies that we are trying to achieve, and in terms of people who can get the work done. It has been repeatedly expressed that the job belongs to the States; they should be doing it under the guidance of the Secretary.

But when the guidelines are established by people whose experience is theory rather than actual practice in the field, sometimes it is a little difficult to follow.

One of my suggestions to this committee would be the adoption of an advisory committee to the Secretary and the Administrator that would be composed of State administrators. Let them meet directly with them, talk out their problems directly, and make formal recommendations of what they should be doing.

It would also be a good advisory group to this committee.

Very frankly, as far as I am concerned, the real hope for water control in the future lies with this committee, on this side rather than the other.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

The second point I would like to mention is solid waste disposal. Mr. Jones made the point on Tuesday, and it was well taken. I am not so pessimistic that I do not think water pollution and air pollution are going to be handled—I am quite pessimistic that, at the rate we are going now, we are not going to have a real solution in terms of solid waste disposal unless we begin to think it out at this stage.

Our whole effort in water pollution is to take the solids out. Our whole effort in air pollution is to take the solids out.

What we have done is dig a hole and move it. We have now got the solids to take care of.

You are in this hassle in the city of Washington, the proposal of taking over the marshlands in the low level down the Potomac. Even