

posing, something new. It was a matter of how we construed the basic tenor of the act, and how we implemented it.

Mr. CRAMER. Can you indicate where in the initial guidelines that was contemplated? You have it before you there, I believe. I have read them, and I do not see it.

GUIDELINE NO. 1 CONTAINS ESSENCE OF NO DEGRADATION POLICY

Secretary UDALL. I think the essence of it is in the very first guideline, policy guideline, water policy standards should be designed to enhance the quality of water.

This is where we got to the real guts of the question. What does that mean?

This was the philosophy that was implicit in the 1965 act, that this was an act to improve water. It is not to degrade water. This is the very first guideline we laid down. It is where we began.

FUTURE LOCATION BY INDUSTRY ON RELATIVELY CLEAN STREAMS

Mr. CRAMER. That implies that any stream that is not presently being used for industrial purposes cannot so be used in the future if that use in any way changes the present condition of the water in any way or to any degree, if it has any degradation whatsoever, even though it means that industry could not locate there, and even though a State might use it to set aside certain streams for that specific purpose of industrial development.

Secretary UDALL. Well, Congressman, we have not taken that kind of rigid view. I do not think you can. And I discussed Alaska as an example, which is largely an undeveloped State in terms of its resources.

We have left the door open to the consideration of any proposals.

On the other hand, I think in most States you are going to find that these prime unpolluted streams are usually your best trout fishing streams, and other streams, and that they are going to protect them.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that.

Secretary UDALL. They are not going to want industry to get on them, at least I do not.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it not true in any instance where the State of Alaska, or any other State, wishes to place industry on a river and there is the prospect of some degree of degradation, that it requires approval by you individually as a Secretary and not by the State?

Secretary UDALL. It would require approval—

Mr. CRAMER. In addition to the States.

Secretary UDALL. It would require joint approval, let us put it that way.

Mr. CRAMER. So, in effect, we are getting right around to what many of us had grave concerns about when this was established in the first place.

And that was that we would end up with the Secretary in effect being able to revoke or not approve or override a State decision to, for instance, locate a plant, even though there was substantial sewage treatment facilities provided which there would be, on a river which