

step in and say the States have not done it, and now we are going to take over. Would you have any comment on this statement?

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, I think I can make a pretty clear-cut statement on that subject, because I think both the Water Quality Act of 1965, if you study it carefully, as well as the 1966 Act, both give the states and local communities, I would say, the lead role in many aspects of water pollution clean-up. Now, obviously, if the Federal Government is going to guarantee the bonds in order to get a lower bond rate, it has got to be concerned about some of the details. Maybe we have too many details written into the act, but I would think, for example, with respect to this user fee provision, that we do have a legitimate concern, if we are going to guarantee the bonds of the community, that they have what we would consider a modern financing method of paying off their own bonding obligations, and this is the reason that we feel that the cities that qualify under this program ought to have what the best cities already have, namely, a sound user fee system, so that the users are paying for the service they receive.

Mr. DENNEY. What are we going to do about a little community of 500 people in discharging sewage into a stream that reaches interstate streams, which cannot have enough users to pay this off?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I think the answer for the small community is that they would not qualify in any event. Under this bond approach that we are presenting here today, it is only the larger communities that would qualify; the smaller community would come in under—

Mr. DENNEY. Under direct grant?

Secretary UDALL. That is right.

Mr. DENNEY. I believe that is all.

(Mr. Howard assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Cramer.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Secretary, I am sorry I was not able to be here during your entire testimony. My plane was a little late. And I, too, appreciate the effort which you are putting forward.

We have, as you know, operated on largely a nonpartisan basis relating to water pollution matters. The last few bills with their conference reports have passed unanimously, as I remember, by the House. This was done, however, only after exhaustive study of the proposals made and rather substantial changes were made, both on this side and the Senate side as well as in conference.

So my question will be directed to an effort to get a clear picture of what we are getting involved in—what this bill will actually do—in the brief time that I have.

OIL POLLUTION CLEANUP IN CASE OF UNKNOWN CULPRIT

No. 1, I see in the morning paper, April 23, that there were oil slicks found off Hawaii's famous Waikiki Beach:

Crude oil from a still undetermined source has left a slimy black ring along a 3-mile stretch of beach. The Coast Guard spotted two more slicks yesterday.

The oil pollution proposal you sent to us would not in any way effect this necessary cleanup job, would it? It would not impose any requirement that this be cleaned up?