

after hearings, after an opportunity was given to municipalities, to industry, to everyone who was interested to come in.

What I am concerned about is at what point do we finally have it determined what water quality standards have been set for a given stream, for a given sector of a river, so that a municipality, industry, can go ahead with their treatment facilities confident that what they are doing is going to comply with the standards not only of the State, but as approved by your Department?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I think this type of assurance must be part of a program I think because New York is a State that has been very thorough, very aggressive about this, that you would find that in our discussion with them about their standards, we are approving all of the main criteria. What we are singling out really for further work are special problems that exist in special rivers or other areas. And I think the best way really to answer that question would be to sit down and go over the present status of the New York standards and to show what our approval has been.

I would say, in the main, that all the States we have been working with the last 3 or 4 months have been pleased and satisfied with the results that we have achieved, and I think their water pollution control people do not have a philosophical or other argument with us with regard to getting more precise answers to some of these problems where we have not been satisfied that the standard setting is precise enough in terms of what the Congress contemplated.

SECONDARY TREATMENT REQUIREMENT

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Secretary, have you required secondary treatment in all cases?

Secretary UDALL. We are urging the States to commit themselves to secondary treatment of municipal wastes in most cases. In our basic guidelines, specifically guideline No. 8 we stated, "Further, no standard will be approved which does not require all wastes, prior to discharge into any interstate water, to receive the best practicable treatment or control unless it can be demonstrated that a lesser degree of treatment or control will provide for water quality enhancement commensurate with proposed present and future water uses." In practice this guideline usually means but not always, secondary treatment of municipal wastes. But it is important to remember that the guidelines suggested certain actions, they did not require them.

Mr. McEWEN. As I understand it, we have had streams where classification has been such that quality of that water could be made clean without the secondary treatment required at this time.

What I ask you now is under what provision of law do you require secondary treatment if the water quality standards do not require it?

Secretary UDALL. While we do not require secondary treatment, it is obvious that the Water Quality Act of 1965 called for upgrading of water quality, which requires a good degree of waste treatment in order to be achieved. Additionally, the act clearly called for plans of implementation to achieve the designated levels of water quality. We at the Federal level have the responsibility to assure that the plans developed by the States for implementing standards are effective and