Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you believe the National Association of Counties would go along with this authority for the Secretary to determine "that the appropriate local public body having jurisdiction over the treatment works has established or agreed to establish (i) a system of charges for the treatment works service area which will be adequate to enable it to be operated in a businesslike manner capable of amortizing treatment works costs together with operation and maintenance costs, and (ii) a reserve to meet, to the greatest extent possible, expansion or replacement requirements of the treatment works service area."

Do you believe the National Association of Counties would be prepared to accept that double requirement by the Secretary?

Mr. WARD. Mr. Edmondson, we would certainly prefer not to have to accept that. As you know, we accept an awful lot of things to get Federal money. This might have to be one of them; but we would prefer not to have that stringent requirement built into the bill itself.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I have spoken to the second part of it, but it is a package proposition.

Mr. BASFORD. I concur personally, because I realize that one of the problems Congress has is turning loose tax dollars to local officials and local people without proper controls to see these things are honestly applied to the purpose for which it is intended. As C. D. said, I am sure local government would not prefer to go quite this far in the bill. If this is the price of getting good proper pollution abatement and to provide sewer treatment facilities at this early date, yes. As an individual I would concur and as a county commissioner. I cannot say this would be the position or philosophy of the National Association.

Mr. WARD. From official policy of the National Association of Counties, we do desire to have as much flexibility in receiving these Federal funds as possible. And we would prefer that this type of structure not be built into the bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. On that point, of course, we have had considerable testimony in opposition.

Mr. BASFORD. I am sure you have.

Mr. CRAMER. To the whole proposition of the Federal Government saying that if you are going to use Federal money, and you pay 30 percent Federal, for instance, it is going to be 70 percent local, because of the 30 percent Federal Government tells them they have to use user charges and user charge has to be sufficient to include also future maintenance and improvements. And so we have had a lot of opposition to that from the standpoint that a lot of the communities do not use that method in the first place.

Mr. BASFORD. I think that our obligation as public officials, both yours and mine, goes to this extent, that we in appropriating moneys from the public Treasury so to speak have a responsibility to see that we do not get all screwed up on this—who pays for what? I do not think it is fair for me to receive sewer services at my house and have Joe Doakes down the street paying it out of his business establishment by ad valorem taxes.

I concur with you wholeheartedly on that.