

for potable water supply or in some cases trout streams, we are going to maintain them as we have classified them.

Now, we could, if we wished, in our State, or any State as I see it, set standards that would absolutely preclude any future industrial growth.

Mr. COFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. McEWEN. That is what we could do. What I am concerned about, and I appreciate your statement here, Mr. Coffey, I think it highlights this, that there apparently is now some thinking in the Federal Water Pollution Administration that certainly does not derive, in my view, from the law that we in this committee took up and passed unanimously in this House of Representatives.

There is a whole new concept here that we are going to make whatever it is better than it is, or we are not going to ever lower any quality in any water, any more effluents, though it may not affect the standard of the water.

I think this is extremely important, Mr. Chairman. Hearings on this legislation have, if you will, given this committee an oversight, an opportunity here to find out what has been going on, and I can assure you it has been enlightening to me, your testimony and other testimony here today.

But I had no idea how far we had gotten away from what was spelled out explicitly, clearly, in the law that we enacted.

Now, we have, as somebody has observed, both an affluent and an effluent society. It seems that the more we eat and the more we produce, the greater our affluence, and the more effluents we have. If we want to give up some of our good living and cut back on the goods and services that we enjoy, we can reduce both our effluents and our affluence.

We have to recognize this, and I think the States are the agencies to look at this in relation to the immediate need of our own people in these waterways. What is their need for potable water supply, for industry, for trout streams, for recreation? I do not believe that anyone, including my good friend, the Secretary, or anyone else here in Washington, has the wisdom to decide all of this here in Washington.

Certainly we have had industrial growth, and we hope we will continue to have it in America, and I hope some of it will be in my congressional district.

I hope we will be allowed to have standards that will accommodate industry as well as other uses that we want to make of our water.

I thank you again, Mr. Coffey. I think your testimony is most helpful.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Not to belabor the point, but has not the Secretary modified his policy to this extent that exceptions may affect the economic or well-being of a particular State?

Mr. COFFEY. At his discretion.

Mr. SULLIVAN. He has that policy approach, does he not?

Mr. COFFEY. The burden of proof there, even though the State board of quality standards would not be violated, any degradation in policy would have to get his office clearance to locate any new or increased source of pollution. And I cannot help but add that this does not only relate to industry. You cannot even have a new town spring up.

Mr. SULLIVAN. This is the point I raised about the social and economic well-being. It covers both of the points.