

Mr. JOHNSON. No, but that was the major reason for which we made this recommendation for hearings before primitive areas could be set aside.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand it is substantial.

Is it your position that you feel that the comparative costs and advantages and disadvantages should be considered rather than this being administered as a prohibition, in effect?

Mr. JOHNSON. The States should take a look at every alternative location. In this matter that we had down in San Antonio, where the local people actually approved the location and ordered the bond issue to buy the right-of-way, I do not think it should have been opened up again.

Mr. CRAMER. That was a city park, was it not, not a federally owned park?

Mr. JOHNSON. That was a city park. As I understand it, there were close to 500 houses that would have to be moved in the alternative location that was asked to be considered.

Mr. CRAMER. Do you have some language you suggest relating to this section that would put it in proper focus in your opinion?

Mr. JOHNSON. Congress wrote a pretty good legislative history on that section.

Mr. CRAMER. It is being ignored, so I thought we might write something into law.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think if that legislative history were put into the act, a condensation of it, it would do the job.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to ask you to consider perhaps embodying that language in some manner in the legislation.

You have referred to the Equal Employment Opportunity program. I presume you are aware of the fact that the Comptroller General has recently provided that specific regulations must be adopted by the Department of Labor. With specific criteria established as a condition precedent to the bid process, do you think that is satisfactory, realizing that Equal Employment Opportunity is the law? It is an approach to this problem, assuming that the Department of Labor might be kind enough to consult with this committee and perhaps with some of the States?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, I think this is real major step in the right direction. I think your committee should meet with them and work out some of the details. I think this is a long step toward being able to specify in the contract exactly the terms that the contractor will be confronted with when he is the low bidder and performs the work.

Mr. CRAMER. We wrote on this subject again of preservation of park lands, in the 1966 Highway Act, public volume 9574, language in there, and this is what I wanted to call your attention to, Mr. Johnson. It took into consideration park lands use.

We wrote in that any land from any Federal, State, or local government, park or historic site, the Secretary shall not approve any program which requires the use of this unless such program includes all possible planning, including consideration of alternatives to the use of such land to minimize any harm to such park or site resulting from such use.

Mr. JOHNSON. That language is all right.