

Secretary that our national policy included assertions which has been deliberately deleted by this committee and by the Congress.

I am sorry my faith was so shallow. Your questions and your comments while the Secretary was testifying left no doubt you knew what you were doing in passing the 1965 and 1966 enactments. Even more, there was no doubt you not only know what is required for accomplishment but you are also close enough to the people to understand and reflect their needs.

As one who is intimately involved with not only the technical problems of what can or can not be done, but also the administrative problems involved with the policy issues, I would like to briefly summarize the situation as I see it in both areas and comment on what is proposed in legislation and on how I believe your leadership can be of further assistance.

SITUATIONS AND CONDITIONS

It is axiomatic that an organization, foundation or bureaucracy can continue indefinitely as long as its pronouncements are limited to "Conditions and Situations" or to "Situations and Conditions" and devoid of debating specific details. If the leader can direct attention to an adequate number of crises, and if he can promise to resolve the crises, growth is insured.

Just how the job is to be done is a detail to be worked out later. Of course, it is difficult to remain on an absolutely generalized basis so one other element is essential to continuing success. The secret to success is vacillation, not perserverance. With a properly moving target and changing ground rules, chances for the opposition to develop controls are drastically lessened.

This committee saw this picture in detail during the testimony by the Secretary on Tuesday. He talked "Conditions and Situations" and answered questions on specifics with "Situations and Conditions". The queries on the necessity for new legislation were answered with promises of accomplishment if the requested authority is granted. Questions on the possibilities for control of oil, for example, were answered with descriptions of the crises of the *Torrey Canyon* and the *Ocean Eagle*. And the dialogue on standards left no doubt the states are faced with a shifting target and changing ground rules.

This committee undoubtedly recalls the battles in 1964, 1965 and 1966 in which the past experience and knowledge of its members prevailed and the Congress passed good legislation. These acts recognized that:

Since pollution is a people's problem it requires personal involvement and acceptance of responsibility by all;

Since it is a highly complicated problem requiring technical expertise it requires competency in leadership and research;

Since it is a costly problem evolved over many decades and since it is in competition with other equally costly and equally necessary problems, it will take an orderly succession of steps and hopefully at least cost in achieving control; and

Since decisions on water control our economy and growth, the people involved must participate in the decisionmaking.

However, there was the possibility that when the states held hearings and set standards, the states would not do an adequate job so the enactment provided that such standards should be reviewed by the Secretary to make sure that they were responsive to the purposes of the act. If my memory serves me correctly, the proposition that the Secretary could dictate standards was expressly rejected. So were the concepts of federal standards and treatment for treatment's sake under the guise of making water as clean as possible. So the Secretary's review was primarily an insurance factor in case the state did not accept its responsibility. If it did not, then the door was open to permit the Secretary to hold conferences and set standards.

But the faith of this committee in their people and in the demands of the people to achieve effective water quality control was not misplaced. The states have accepted their responsibility and have done a credible job. There may be arguments about some of the standards adopted but if they are inadequate, this will be demonstrated in short order once the program is underway.

However, in order to center the authority in one individual, the Congress has detailed a number of jobs specifically to the Secretary of Interior. But of even more importance, the Congress has given the Secretary discretionary authority in several instances. Even though the Congress has included guidelines for