

orderly procedures established in the 1965 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, before they have even been given a trial. So far the Secretary of the Interior has approved—in many cases conditionally—water quality standards covering all common water pollutants, including oil, for a majority of the States. Hopefully, the other States will soon also receive approval of their proposals.

We know of no case where any State's standards have been held up or refused because of imperfections in proposals for dealing with pollution by oil. Clearly, if the Secretary of the Interior has reason to believe any State has not made adequate provision for dealing with oil pollution, he has the authority, under present law, to withhold approval of the State's standards and implementation plans or, if necessary, to set and enforce standards of his own.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES IN CONTROL OF SHORE INSTALLATIONS

As a practical matter, the Federal Government would probably find it difficult to exercise effective control over all shore installations. It must be remembered that S. 2760 would apply to countless thousands of shore installations, both little and big, most of which have no connection with the oil industry. Included would be factories and utilities that use oil for fuel, lubrication, or cooling.

Many less obvious onshore sources, which S. 2760 would not cover, can and do contribute to accidental oil pollution. For example, hundreds of gallons of fuel oil recently showed up in a major east coast harbor. Investigation by the port authority revealed that the oil had leaked from a fuel storage tank in the basement of the school in the city into a sewer and eventually into the harbor. It is difficult to see how the Federal Government could deal more effectively with such problems than the States.

There would be tremendous duplication of personnel if they did try to cover it. The States would still have to control their intrastate waters.

In short, we think that direct Federal regulation of shore installations would establish a precedent that is inconsistent with the spirit of the Water Pollution Control Act. It is not justified on the basis of need; it holds little promise of providing better solutions than State and local control, and it could actually discourage present sincere efforts to solve the problem on a local basis.

COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS AT MAJOR HARBORS

Now, I think the committee would be interested in hearing about the cooperative efforts of petroleum companies and others to provide swift action to contain and remove spilled oil at major harbors and along major waterways where petroleum cargo vessels traffic creates a potential for such spills.

Briefly, these efforts follow this general pattern:

The oil companies and other industries with terminal facilities on the harbor meet with representatives of interested government agencies, such as the local port authority, the fire department, the State police, the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers, and, in a few instances, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.