There is one thing about the water pollution control program. If 're clean up our rivers and our lakes, everyone will benefit. And our hildren and theirs will benefit and maybe they should pay a little it on this. Maybe they should share in the cost.

Under your highway program, you finish the Interstate Highway etwork, it is paid for, and the people that use it the next 20 years rom now, they use it free. They do not have to pay anything. We aid for it.

I think you can argue this thing both ways.

So that I would say we would rather have the cash grant approach. Ve would rather pay as we go. However, since we do not have that ind of money available now, I think this is a good substitute. I would ather see the other, if I had my preference, but I think that you can ıstify it as a sound approach, because this is precisely the way the ities and the States are financing this type of public works projec'.

Mr. WRIGHT. In that connection, I wonder if you have explored 'ith the Appropriations Committee or any of its members their atti- ıde toward this kind of arrangement, as Mr. Hughes described it——

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, I explained this to both of my .ppropriations Committees, the Public Works Appropriations Com- ıittees, earlier this year. And I went into great detail on it. I thought made a very good record on it.

I will be candid with the committee. I know Congressman Davis f Wisconsin was one, and others, said they did not indicate neces- ırily that they were against it, but they said that they did not like ıe aspect that you were getting what they called an automatic com- ıitment by the Federal Government which becomes one of those ncontrollable items with regard to budgets. And it does have that egative aspect to it. We might as well be honest about it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I suppose some of these fellows are inclined to call nything of this type that obligates us in the future without giving the ppropriating process annual review, they are inclined to call it back- oor financing. I wonder if they would apply that term to this pproach?

Secretary UDALL. This would not be back-door financing. We have ıade it very plain to them. That is the reason that I brought the sub- ect up with the committees. I told them this legislation was pending. Ve hoped it would be enacted. We thought it would get us on schedule; ut that we would review the matter with them each year. We would ring our commitments to them. We would lay the whole thing out. .nd this would enable us to make them a party to the whole program, nd this is what we envision.

You see, Congressman, just to give you some idea of the magnitudes ere, we could move 2 fiscal years from now to $1.25 billion in Fed- ral commitments. And let us assume we still only had $225 million in rants. In other words, this would be over a billion in Federal commit- ıents for something in the beginning on the order of $30 to $35 mil- on that we would pay the first year. In fact, next fiscal year there will e no Federal outlay whatsoever because the first payments do not ome due for 1 year from the time we sign the first contract.

Mr. WRIGHT. Laying aside any possible legal aspects, I am certain ıat if the Congress were going to take this approach, it would have