

I would like to know just how many areas there are in the country that fit that description and what percentage of the people in the United States are included in that?

Secretary UDALL. Mr. Moore tells me that there are 233 standard metropolitan statistical areas, and I do not know whether we can give you the percentage of population. We can certainly furnish it for the record.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would you supply, for the record the number of people living in standard metropolitan statistical areas.

Secretary UDALL. Yes.

(The information referred to follows:)

April 1965 population estimates (1960 figures for the two SMSA's defined since the most recent compilation) indicate that approximately 124 million persons live in the 233 metropolitan statistical areas of the United States.

(See also, p. 610, May 2, 1968.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Now, just a rough calculation in my own State I know that this 50,000 city level which I understand applies would probably take care of only 3 of the 6 congressional districts in the State of Oklahoma; I know that this population level which I understand applies would probably take care of only 3 of the 6 congressional districts in the State of Oklahoma. Over in the neighboring State of Arkansas, I think it would probably take care of 2 of the 4 congressional districts in the State of Arkansas if my knowledge of the population statistics in the State is accurate. I think you are going to find a lot of congressional districts in the country left out of this new device and its helpfulness if the Oklahoma-Arkansas situation is typical.

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, Mr. Moore wants to comment. Let me say, however, that the Senate committee, when they held our hearing 3 weeks ago, inquired into this subject. I am sure this is a matter the committee will want to go into. We felt we had a valid reason and a good cutoff point with regard to the 125,000 population cutoff that was used for the standard statistical area. But I think the committee has every right and reason to want to know why or what the reasons are for drawing a line in any particular place.

It is our anticipation of course that under the cash grant program which has traditionally been the program that the smaller communities have looked to, that most of them will get their money from that part of the program, and obviously if that is the case, the areas in which most of the people live and most of the waste treatment construction will take place, will be assisted under the new side of the program.

Mr. MOORE. Congressman, I just want to make the comment that the act, prior to 1966, had a limitation as to the dollar amount of an individual grant. This limitation ranged from \$250,000 prior to 1961 up to \$2.4 million after 1965 for a multimunicipal project. The dollar ceiling of necessity caused the initial years of the program to concentrate primarily in less populous areas, and not in areas where waste treatment facilities were of such cost that this limit would not make a major contribution to extremely large facilities.

There is in the present act, and the Secretary has mentioned this there is in the present act still the requirement that 50 percent of the first \$100 million appropriated in any year has to be utilized for con-