Secretary UDALL. First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend ne decision of this committee to have one hearing and consider all of

ne pending water pollution bills.

Without doubt, in my judgment the legislation you are considering ere today is as vital as any conservation legislation pending before is Congress. And I am very hopeful that we can get legislation betre the Congress adjourns in the very vital areas of full funding for ater pollution grants to meet the requirements of the 1966 act as rell as action to give us the remedies and the tools we need to combat il pollution.

You have before you this morning clean water legislation proposed y the administration—namely the Water Quality Improvement Act f 1968—the Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Control Act of 968, and legislation to control pollution from vessels within naviga-

le waters. We urge enactment of these bills.

Additionally, we urge the enactment of S. 2760, already passed by 12 Senate, which deals with important aspects of the oil pollution roblem, as well as with lake eutrophication and acids and other mine ater pollution.

## THE WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1968

It is the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968 that I would like of discuss first, Mr. Chairman. I would say that no conservation measure is more important. I think this legislation holds the key to shifting to high gear the water pollution control program—a level that we re now ready to achieve after 2 years of very hard work to establish ur water quality standards. We are at the point now where if we can et the right action tempo at the local level by the cities, with the tates and the Federal Government doing their part, then I think we an see the fur really fly in terms of water pollution action.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, of course, calls for the establishment of enforceable State water standards on all interstate and coastal aters. We have approved, I think, 29 or 30 of the State standards. he rest will be approved soon. I would say we are making very good

eadway with regard to the water quality standards.

In these standards are included implementation plans which call for ne construction of needed waste treatment works on a timely basis. Indeed, water quality standards submitted by a State is a schedule, n action timetable to get the cleanup program down. But of course ll of these municipal treatment works cost money, large sums of

ioney.

Our Interior Department report, which we call "The Cost of Clean Vater" submitted to Congress in January, states that the "cost of conructing municipal waste treatment plants and interceptor sewers is stimated at \$8 billion, exclusive of land and associated costs" over the ext 5 years. We have some indications that these initial estimates may conservative. Whatever these costs finally turn out to be, the fact mains that these facilities will be needed or communities will not teet the schedules of the water quality standards and will face State and Federal enforcement actions.