

since people's memories are short, he makes the practice of taking pictures of children's eyes before he starts a series of treatments to correct crossed eyes. Otherwise, the mother seldom believes he has made much improvement when the final adjustment is completed. People do not remember how bad things were 20 years ago. They can't see improvement from last year and so are unhappy.

Progress has been great and it should not be permitted to be slowed down either by changes in legislation or by vacillating policy, regardless of how well intentioned either may be.

This committee by its pronouncement now can assure continued progress. The committee's past reports offered guidance to the federal agency which was ignored. The House Appropriations Committee report (July 1967) was blunt in its criticism of the manner in which the Secretary has directed the program. This can now be corrected by this committee for it understands the situation. The Senate Committee does not. The incentive for action by this committee was well stated in the Appropriations Committee report:

"As the power to control water quality and quantity is not only the power to make or break business and agriculture but is a power over the life of the Nation itself, it is essential that the FWPCA not only closely coordinate its plans and activities with all the Federal agencies involved, but also with each of the states, local jurisdictions, and private interests affected by the program. The imposition of restrictions and controls without full and equitable consideration of the essential and varied interests involved in water supply, including priority of use and riparian rights, could have a most serious adverse effect on the various segments of the economy dependent upon water for their existence. The Committee wishes to emphasize the importance, therefore, of the new Administration undertaking its most difficult and essential program of water pollution control with a sense of balance and caution to assure any disruptive or adverse effects on the economy are minimized."

Mr. KINNEY. I would first express my apologies to the committee for my lack of faith. After listening to the Senate hearings in March, I sort of assumed that perhaps, after winning the battles of 1964, 1965, and 1966, the House had now lost the battle because of opinions that I was hearing on the Senate side.

But after these last 3 days, well, I find that my faith was shallow. Your understanding of what you are doing and why you are doing it is still there.

So we still have a real hope for the effective water pollution control.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

The first point that I would emphasize is the comments from the discussion you have heard on this so-called antidegradation clause. Now, in fact, all States have a true antidegradation clause. I do not know of any State that will not stop projects where the residual discharge, even after treatment, would cause an effect against the use of the stream. The use for waste discharge is not permitted. But the comment that was made that the purpose of this clause is to provide water on the safe side rather than as dirty as possible, and I think this statement has been made too often and without any real background.

What it has done has tended to give the idea that the States are trying to promote as much waste into the streams as they can, and for those who have been associated with the administration of these programs within the governmental agencies, as I have, you know that you cannot take a chance on a deal like that. You are promoting something that would be on the safe side to start with. It has tended to confuse the issues.

You had a copy of a brief that was submitted to you prepared by Covington and Burling on this issue, and I would like to add to the