

Federal Government is staying in the picture too much and that we are going to make the basic decisions, that this is not the way that the program is working out in fact.

If we approve the State standards and——

Mr. CRAMER. Including nondegradation.

Secretary UDALL. An get nondegradation language with them, the only time, probably, that we are going to be called into the picture is when a big argument develops within a State, and it is usually going to be the sportsmen and the conservation interests against industry. Let us be frank about it. When the argument develops, if this involves the nondegradation issue, we may be brought into it. But we are not sitting looking over the shoulders of the States. Those standards have been approved. We do not want to, and we expect to get in only in those rare cases where there is argument, whether the State is observing its standards, whether it is enforcing its standards.

It is really up to the States to be vigorous about it.

Mr. CRAMER. You are actually in it. That is all I have.

MEANING OF "NO DEGRADATION" POLICY

Mr. McEWEN. I do not have a transcript of your testimony before the committee in the other body, but I have a copy of Conservation News, April 15, in which they say, referring to you, Mr. Secretary:

He said he resolved this issue by requiring that standards shall include a provision to assure that present water quality will not be degraded.

I quote further from this:

We are asking, Mr. Udall said, that a paragraph be included in enforceable standards, substantially in accord with the following:

Then it quotes, I assume from the standard, Mr. Secretary, and I would like to know if this is correct:

Water whose existing quality is better than the established standard as of the date on which such standards became effective will be maintained at their existing high quality. These and other waters of your State will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State water pollution control agency and the Department of Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in, such waters.

Is that correct?

Secretary UDALL. This is the water quality degradation statement, the policy statement that we issued.

Mr. McEWEN. Is it not fair to assume that you are going to be under that policy in the middle of every controversy in every one of the 50 States where the Isaak Walton League or the local fish and game club, or whoever it may be, feels that a plant is going to, as it would of necessity, I would think, somewhat downgrade the quality of the water, even though it would not affect the standard that had been set on that water?

THE WATER QUALITY ACT NOT A DEGRADATION ACT

Secretary UDALL. Your State conservation agencies these days are just as sensitive to the Isaak Walton League as I am. They are going