

Mr. DENNEY. I have never seen it in writing. This has just been told to me orally.

Mr. MOORE. No, I must emphasize again there are certain exceptions in most of the States' standards, and certainly there is no intent during the course of this fiscal year, before this procedure is concluded, to cut off the construction grants for the States.

Mr. DENNEY. Well now, I just have one more question, and it always concerns me in any legislation that the drafter, Secretary Udall, and your Commission has done an outstanding job. You are working with the States and I commend you for it.

How do we know who is going to be the next Secretary of Interior or the next Commissioner?

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

Are we turning over authority to the point where we, as Members of Congress, are abrogating our office to the point where we can write up standards and say to the States, "Your standards are not satisfactory unless you have done such and such."

Mr. MOORE. I think in terms of the continuing responsibility of the Department of Interior or the Secretary, or the Commissioner, it would be hard for me to foresee the time when the Congress would in any event surrender its oversight of these activities in terms of the application of these various procedures. These are attempts to arrive at the objective, and always in the process of proposing a particular procedure you inevitably come up with a better working relationship if you pursue the matter. There is better understanding in terms of the relationship between the Federal agencies and the State, if you do pursue it, and have the understanding that I think you can.

Mr. DENNEY. For instance, I have in my hand a letter dated January 31, 1968, written by Mr. H. C. Ray for Robert S. Burd, to my State of Nebraska, where it says, "As I explained in my recent telephone call, it is our policy to secure a firm commitment to secondary treatment."

Now, if, in effect, the States adopt these standards, send them in, and here is the Federal Government writing to the States saying, "Look, your standards are pretty good, except for this that you have to put in."

Now, tell me who is writing the standards.

Mr. MOORE. Well, the alternative, of course, would be to say at some point: It would be disapproved in terms of the question of secondary treatment. This is one that is unresolved in several of the midwestern States.

As the chairman has indicated, my prior association has been with the State of Texas. In terms of secondary treatment, I believe this is a matter where the technology is known and the need is such that it should be applied across the board.

We had there applied it within the State of Texas at the State level, insisted upon secondary treatment, but I think it might be unfair for us to indicate to a State that its standards were unsatisfactory without indicating where or in what regard they were felt to be unsatisfactory.