

is the human needs factor. These are quite different. Capital improvements can be paid for, and then constitute a continuing cost. This cannot be said, as I see it, where the increased input of social services to a particular area are involved. Are these meant to be continuing costs to the Federal Government?

Secretary WEAVER. Well, I think there are two categories of these. In the first place, there are those costs which are now provided for by grant-in-aid programs in which the Federal Government makes a partial grant. These are, as you know, over the various terms, depending upon the nature of the services. Obviously these would be continuing.

Secondly, there would be those services which would have to be augmented during the period of this particular proposal. Here you would have the supplemental money being used over a period of time.

Mr. ASHLEY. As far as the social services are concerned, we are now primarily being paid by the local community, this would be a contribution of almost every Governor for the duration of the program in the 6 years, is that correct?

Secretary WEAVER. Well, the program would have to be effected in the sense of being substantially completed from the physical side of it within a period of 5 or 6 years. The question of how the services would be financed and for how long, would have to, I am afraid, be handled on a case-by-case basis. There is nothing in the law that would limit the period. Some might go beyond the period which we call the completion of the project. Because this is completion more or less in its physical rather than its social aspects. Obviously, there would be a problem here. It could not go on ad infinitum.

Mr. ASHLEY. Precisely. Under the OEO program we have the same kind of a problem, where services are provided, where funding is on an annual basis, and the cities engaging in the program find it difficult to sustain services that have been initiated. Is there this problem?

Secretary WEAVER. There is this problem. But I don't think it is quite as severe here, because in the first place we are talking about an appropriation over a 5-year period which gives you more than just the annual appropriation problem.

Secondly, I think there is the fact that some of these programs, particularly some of these social programs, if they are successful will have less of a need after the 5-year period. If you are training people, for example, who are not yet employable, over a 5-year period you should get over the bulk of that, and you would not have to continue to spend as much money after 5 years for that as you did during the first 5 years.

Mr. ASHLEY. Doctor, have you had a chance to examine the amendments that several of us have worked out?

Secretary WEAVER. Yes, I have.

Mr. ASHLEY. I wonder if you would care to comment on adding some additional criteria for eligibility. The amendment addresses itself to two additional criteria. First, that the sections of the neighborhood in question be subject to higher priority economic and social pressures, such as population density, crime rate, public welfare participation, delinquency rate, unemployment, educational level, health and disease characteristics, and degree of substandard and dilapidated