

NEED FOR RESEARCH

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First I want to say to my former colleague that it is good to see you here again. I have read your book and I commend you for that.

I have just one question, an observation, which deals with research. I am one who believes that there is a need for a lot more research. And I would like to ask this question: Would you consider amending this section so that we can have the benefit of experience the Highway Commission had had with the Bureau of Roads, with the State highway commission, where they have the efforts of private enterprise, communities, of States, and the Federal Government, so that we can more truly reflect the changing needs for resolving the pollution problem?

It seems to me that we can find some more economical answers and better answers to some of these problems.

Also because of present growth, I am aware of the fact that the watershed, the water control on land, is not unrelated to this problem. In fact, the completion of the watershed program itself would make the resolution of the pollution problem that we are talking about here today much easier; is that right?

Secretary UDALL. I would agree with your last point, Congressman. And I share your belief in the efficacy of good research programs. I would like to give you a piece of paper that lays out the magnitude and the nature of our research effort that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has going. We think it is a very good one. And a lot of that is joint research where we do have partners in it.

I think that is some of the best money we spend, in trying to find better ways, and more efficient and cheaper ways, of getting the job done.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. This is all, Mr. Chairman. I understand you will be back day after tomorrow, and I want to pursue this and some other matters that have occurred in this colloquy.

Mr. McEWEN. Could I have a clarification?

When is Secretary Udall coming back.

Mr. HOWARD. I believe we have been informed sometime next week. I believe we are discussing either Wednesday or Thursday, that the Secretary will be able to return.

Mr. McEWEN. Of next week?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes. Next week. And Mr. Moore will be available this afternoon.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa said he has read his book. I bought it, and I think that would qualify for me an opportunity to ask some questions next week.

TOTAL FEDERAL COST OF CONTRACT PROPOSAL

Mr. CRAMER. May I just recap this, so that it is understood.

As I understand it, this authorization of \$2.275 billion Federal share in contracts means that by passing this bill and you agreeing to that limit, which you don't have to do, would mean that it would be matched by approximately \$2.275 billion locally, perhaps a little more. But that would be a Federal guarantee, right?

Mr. HUGHES. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Contingent liability. So we are up to \$4.5 billion.