

to do its job of cleaning up. If we can ask the taxpayers to spend \$2.2 billion, plus whatever additional obligations are involved in this, why cannot some real leadership be given to encouraging industry to do its job?

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, I commented earlier, before you came in, on the industry aspect. I think industry is doing quite well.

Mr. CRAMER. It could do better with incentive, though, could it not?

Secretary UDALL. Well, they might do better with incentives, but I am very pleased that most of them are not sitting waiting for incentive. Most of them know that we mean business with water quality standards, and they are changing to good modern equipment in their new plants. I think this is a very encouraging sign. Industry is not complaining as much as we think.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, I have heard from quite a few. I did not say that they are complaining, but they need assistance, and they need help. I personally favor tax credits, deductions or incentives in some way to get them into a better position to help them clean up the rivers.

#### WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

You stated that over half the States standards have been approved. Is it not true that 10 States whose standards were approved by you have been called back because you have changed your mind as to what the standards should be in order to meet your approval?

Secretary UDALL. With 10 of the States, these were the first States that we approved, we have not basically changed the approval; we have raised one or two new questions—

Mr. CRAMER. Like what?

Secretary UDALL. With them.

Mr. CRAMER. Like what, for instance?

Secretary UDALL. What actually occurred, Congressman, is that we went through the process of setting standards. We learned certain things that we did not know in the beginning. We surfaced certain problems that we were not aware of, and therefore we improved the standards and we have had to go back to the earliest States that we approved in June last year, some of them, and say that we would like to have a couple of changes made. But we have not disapproved their standards, and we have at the present approved 31 States. We have several others that are nearly ready for approval.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate that. However, I would like to know what some of the changes were.

#### "NO DEGRADATION POLICY"

Secretary UDALL. Well, the main change, the one that has gotten the most publicity, was the change with regard to what has been called the "no degradation policy" and most of the States are accepting this. Some are arguing with us about it, and we are compromising, working out compromise language with most of them to incorporate what we consider sound language to implement the 1965 Act.

Mr. CRAMER. Now, does "no degradation of existing water quality" mean that on a river, although it is adaptable to industrial development, for instance, or farming or what-have-you,—surface drainage