

is just as much a problem—where that river today is without that industry or farming, and is a relatively clean river, that in the future this “non-degradation” means that river must remain in the same quality?

Secretary UDALL. Our interpretation—

Mr. CRAMER. Therefore, that industry could not come in in some instances?

Secretary UDALL. Our interpretation of the 1965 Act is that the Congress intended it as a water improvement act, as an improvement of quality, and that the whole concept was that we would be enhancing the quality as the program moved ahead.

Now, this does not mean no new development and I have had to explain this laboriously to some of the State people that were concerned about it. Let's take an average river that has several cities that discharge effluent, some treated, some untreated, and several industries, some put treated effluent in, some untreated effluent, and the “no-degradation policy” there would mean, for example, that as your clean-up program moved forward, and the minute one community or one industry cleaned up its effluent substantially, the river would be of higher quality, and the other thing that is enormously helpful is that most of the new modern plants, industrial plants that are going on, are installing, because of the water quality standards, very modern equipment, and therefore the amount of effluent that they put in that diminishes the quality is rather small as compared with the earlier plants. Therefore, nondegradation does not mean no new industrial development. It simply means we have got to keep a clean-up program going in order to accommodate new industry.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it your philosophy that there are no rivers, that there are no streams, the use of which by industry is justified to the extent of some pollution some degradation of the rivers, necessitated by the nature of the industry?

Secretary UDALL. Some States have deliberately in their water quality standards set aside some rivers. There are prime trout streams and your upland streams, and they have set them aside to not be used for certain purposes and not be polluted in any way, and I think this is a very good policy.

Mr. CRAMER. I asked you the reverse question, however. Are there streams in which you would approve some degradation because of their particular applicability for industrial development and so forth?

Well, let me give you an example—in other words, you cannot have clean waters on every river where you have industry no matter what cleanup effort they make. Industry in some forms by its nature has to cause some degree of pollution.

When you say “no degradation,” that would seem to me to limit the use of the shoreland by the control of standards in that manner.

Congressman, there are two answers. I tried to give you the one a moment ago, with regard to how we feel this will actually work. And as the cleanup program moves forward, there is room to accommodate additional uses—additional industrial uses, let us say, or additional municipal loads, and still have what will probably be a cleaner river.

Then we have other situations. Let us take the State of Alaska, which is largely undeveloped. They have many large rivers there