

to recognize that such obligations as were incurred would be somewhat obligatory and mandatory on future Congresses for appropriations for amounts to pay on national—to the sense that our national debts are obligatory—they are beyond our control. There is not any way that Congress can exercise 1 year of control over that amount other than by what legislation we might enact to influence interest rates.

There is to my mind a further question. This country continues to grow and I presume it will continue in the future to grow. I assume that our cities will continue to experience the burgeoning growth that they have had the last few years, perhaps accelerate. I anticipate that the needs may become even more demanding than they are today. What happens now if we obligate all this money that we think we can afford to pay off bonds for facilities that have been built in what we might call a crash program, and then we encounter greater demands in the future than we had anticipated and have not got any money left to help finance new construction?

Secretary UDALL. Well, let me discuss that question as candidly as I can with you, because the Congress 2 years ago, when you wrote the 1966 act, set the levels of Federal participation for a 5-year program. You were attempting at that time to forecast what the needs would be and we made the first cost study since then, which you have before you.

Here we are 2 years later, back reviewing the whole matter. We are in trouble, and we are trying to keep the program on schedule. I would anticipate that this is going to be the process that we will have to go through, and that 2 years, 3 years from now we will be back again trying to look at what the national needs are to see whether we are on schedule and so on.

But I think our view at this writing would be that, because of the fact that setting the water-quality standards has taken really a year longer than we thought it would, it was a bigger job than I think anyone else realized when we began it. Therefore, I think it would be our view that if we can move ahead on this schedule that is laid out, at least for the next 2 or 3 years, and scale up, moving up to \$700 million of Federal assistance, to a billion, to \$1.25 billion, that this is going to get a very vigorous program going.

It is going to really be moving almost from low gear into high gear in terms of community action if we move ahead.

Then we can come back and review it at that point to see whether we are meeting the national needs. I think we can meet them. And I think the program as we have it laid out is a pretty sound one as far as we know today.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Secretary, I have some other questions. I do not want to usurp the time. I know some other members of the committee have some questions they want to ask. I assume that you or some of the people from your staff will be available to us throughout the remainder of our deliberations.

Let me just say that while I do have some quite serious reservations about this long-term bonding approach, I certainly do want to congratulate you for your continuing interest and imaginative approach for all the work that has gone into the approach.

Thank you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Cleveland.