

don't see that your bill necessarily does this—but I would hate to see this emphasis made.

Mr. REUSS. May I call attention to the fact that the technological, of course, was merely one of five aspects which are listed as technological, financial, economic, governmental and social? Does not a reading of that reduce the swelling a bit as far as your Department is concerned?

Secretary WEAVER. A bit.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Dr. Weaver. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Present: Representatives Barrett (presiding), Mrs. Sullivan, Ashley, Moorhead, Stephens, St Germain, Gonzalez, Reuss, Widnall, Fino, and Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. BARRETT. The committee will come to order.

This morning we operated on a 5-minute rule. We hope to give the members an opportunity to ask questions for a longer period this afternoon. And therefore we are going to operate under the 10-minute rule.

Mr. Secretary, as I understand, the funds for actual planning under the metropolitan planning program, they will come from the existing section 701 program. Under that law most areas get only a two-thirds grant, while the depressed areas can get up to three-fourths. This bill would authorize higher ratio grants under another program as an inducement to planning. But frankly I am surprised to see that there is no increase in the planning grant ratio. Wouldn't you consider it logical to increase the ratio of planning grants to the same 80-percent ratio as you propose for the demonstration cities—

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Resumed

Secretary WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, we have had, as you know, a period of some years of experience with the 701 planning grant. To date we have not found that the present ratio has created any difficulty to the participating local units of government, nor has it been a deterrent to this type of planning. We didn't increase it because we didn't think it was necessary, and we didn't want to have a higher ratio than was necessary, since this would probably represent an undue Federal participation.

I would say that if there is any evidence that an increase is needed we certainly will reflect that in our legislative proposal. But to date this hasn't occurred. We haven't had difficulty here.

I think the difference between these two programs is that the demonstration cities program involves activities which the cities would like to do but just do not have the financial resources to carry out. This is well documented by their own condition and by the condition that is reflected in the amount of taxes that they can collect, and their expenditures.