

visory Committee are free agents, that they in fact come together because we ask them to come because they have something to offer.

This means that they have to become involved. Bringing this about is not just something that one legislates; this is done by a variety of techniques, some of which this committee is well accustomed.

Mr. DADDARIO. This gets you back to that formula you have established for yourself in bringing together the best possible people in order to accomplish your objectives.

Dr. MIDDLETON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. This is the status at the moment?

Dr. MIDDLETON. Just the normal clearance system in government seems to be an arduous task. My restlessness is something that I will apparently have to be content with.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Dr. Middleton, as I understand—and I hate to belabor this question. But relative to State and National rights as far as State rights are concerned, as I understand it, a State can take a more stringent action on air pollution.

You say on page 8, "The act prescribes procedures to be followed in the event a State either fails to meet its obligations or submits standards which are not consistent with the provisions of the act."

Again we go back to that situation, if a State were to take some actions that were not consistent with the provisions of the act, acting perhaps in advance of what your office would want them to do, what would be the situation? Would you be able to say no if Los Angeles or California decided to move on something that was not exactly consistent with the provisions of the act? You would be able to prevent them from acting, is that correct?

Dr. MIDDLETON. Again, Mr. Bell, I need to reiterate our desire to see States such as California step forward and offer some leadership. It is not the intent of the Federal Government to forestall control of air pollution at the State and local level. Consistent with the act in this sense can be construed to mean that when the criteria are published and the State says they intend to adopt a standard, the standard they then promulgate, or propose, when sent to the Secretary, is found to be consistent with the published criteria. If the standard is half as potent as it should be, based on criteria, it is nonconsistent and poorer.

Mr. BELL. The State standard is better?

Dr. MIDDLETON. The State standard in that case is a larger number, which means less good. Not half, meaning twice as good. Are we confused or together at this point?

Mr. BELL. I think we are together.

Dr. MIDDLETON. I mean if the State comes up with a standard that is poor and inconsistent with the criteria, then there is a course of action to bring the views together and make a finding. The finding is binding.

Mr. BELL. In other words, what you really are saying is if they reach an impasse where there is a difference of opinion, it would be the same thing. Try to bring the views together. You are not going to say the Federal Government must bring your standards into a system with our provisions?

Dr. MIDDLETON. We are saying the standard advocated, recommended by the State and reviewed by the Secretary, must be consistent