

the quality of the water, even though the water is still acceptable for its classified use.

Our whole program in New York State was based on a classification of streams from the trout waters to the stream that would not be suitable for fishing, for recreation, but for industry use.

I suggest, Mr. Secretary, that this is something that very much needs clarification.

I will yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

COST OF CLEAN WATER

Mr. CLEVELAND. I think this dialog is interesting, too, Mr. Secretary. One of the problems that I have noticed during your remarks, when you came before us last week, was you outlined the several major acts that we passed in the last couple of years, and it seems to me every time we pass one of these acts, everyone gets the impression, whether erroneously or not, but they seem to get the impression that, "Boy, this has done it." "Now we are going to have clean waters", and it is all done.

In this connection I think it would be helpful if somewhere along the line somebody put into the record, either now or later on in these hearings, just what the estimated total cost of accomplishing our stated objectives is going to be. I remember when we had our hearings 2 years ago that we were talking about Lake Erie, and of course the estimate of what it is going to cost to clean up Lake Erie ran all over the place, somebody said \$5 billion and somebody \$20 billion; and they were not hard figures.

Mr. Secretary, do you have an estimate of what it will cost nationwide to accomplish our stated objectives?

Is that figure available? I think it would be a startling figure, but at least it would put this thing in perspective.

Secretary UDALL. Our last study in terms of the present contemplated standards and programs is \$8 billion for municipal action—I am not talking about the storm drainage problem—and for industry, \$2.6 to \$4.6 billion.

Mr. CLEVELAND. This is just a beginning, is it not?

Secretary UDALL. Of course it is just a beginning, because this is really the backlog problem, and installation for expansion of cities and for new industries, of installation of new equipment which industry is moving toward already, and so are the cities. But I think this is a very useful discussion.

INTENT OF WATER QUALITY ACT TO UPGRADE—NOT DOWNGRADE— NATION'S STREAMS

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, I voted for this, and participated in its shaping, and I certainly, for my part, did not anticipate that this was going to provide for the degradation of streams that were pristine. We were trying to upgrade and not downgrade, and if the impression gets abroad that we are going to backtrack now and permit industry, facing the installation of expensive equipment, go up to some trout stream and locate there, then we are going to be just going backward.

And I read that Business Week story, too, and I am very impressed with what industry is doing. I think, for one reason, they feel that this