

much Albert Rains' retirement a couple of years ago. I knew you could not keep a good man down and it was so good to see this magnificent contribution that he has made to historic preservation. I want to thank him and Mr. Gray and Bill Widnall for putting on our desks the volume "With Heritage So Great." I take it these are for us. I certainly think it will bring a lot of joy to all of us. I notice that you have some of the greatest writers in the country, Sidney Hyman and so on do some of the pieces. I will read it with a great deal of interest.

I also commend Mr. Widnall for introducing this bill and promise him right now my full support of it.

I would have just one question of you gentlemen and that concerns the relationship between the Widnall-Muskie legislation and the companion bill now before the House Interior Committee. Is there overlapping in the grant provisions to local governments of those bills, particularly in respect to grants to local governments for projects for historical preservation and grants to the National Trust for Historic Preservation to provide financial assistance for preservation projects? How do those gear into the urban renewal features of the Widnall bill?

Mr. RAINS. There is nothing, Henry, in the bill that is pending before the Interior Committee that would give any grants that come under the urban renewal program. While I have not examined it with the fine-tooth comb, there is not any overlapping. The grants provided in each of the bills will only apply to whatever the program is in that particular bill. They are companion measures.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Widnall, the grant section of your bill uses the urban renewal technique which I take it means 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent Federal and one-third local, is that not right?

Mr. WIDNALL. The intent—that is the intent.

Mr. REUSS. What percentage are the Interior bill grants?

Mr. GRAY. There is a—I should say there is an inconsistency between the two bills in one respect. In the bill before this committee, any grants to the National Trust for matching purposes would be a two-thirds-one-third basis and the Interior bill has a similar provision—I beg your pardon. There are two bills pending before the other committee, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. One introduced by Mr. Widnall and one introduced by a request by Mr. Aspinall. There are some divergencies I might say in these bills. In particular, in one case, the grants are proposed in a 50-50 basis and the other two-thirds/one-third. There will have to be some reconciliation between those. I am not an expert in these matters but I would guess from reading the three pieces of legislation already pending that there must be some meshing.

In specific answer to your question to overlapping, there is a provision in the bill before the other committee which makes it impossible for a project to receive Federal funds from one agency when it has received Federal funds from another. In other words, no State could go to the Interior and get part of the money and then to HED and get the remainder of the money. They are mutually exclusive by provision in that bill and should be, of course.

Mr. REUSS. I am concerned that there should be uniformity of treatment and it would not make sense for example for a historic building that happened to be in an urban renewal area to get two thirds