

how you think that Congress should rest easy with a situation where the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is under no congressionally imposed obligation to take important matters in dispute with other agencies to the Chief Executive for resolution.

Secretary WEAVER. I think that he has some such obligation because he has to exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development. In addition, there will be an Assistant Secretary whose main concern will be this particular area. I think there is administrative machinery moving toward this. Whether it is moving fast enough or not is something I would have to look at after a little more experience and more cogitation.

Mr. REUSS. We will await your response on that.

The second proposed amendment has been alluded to briefly by Mr. Ashley. That has to do with the demonstration cities program and the reaction of some of us to the criteria for qualifying cities under this program. I have a fear on reading the administration's bill that this whole thing is somewhat of a lottery, that the standards are so vague and general that 3 cities might apply, or 300. There is a point of equity, and a point, too, in keeping faith with the cities. After all, if you have invested them with the first-stage, 90-percent planning assistance, it is going to be very disappointing to some if they come in and are told, "This is only for 60 cities, and you are the 200th city, and while your program technically complies, we are not going to admit you to this select company, and you thus don't get any of the 80 percent matching funds."

Therefore, our idea was to beef up the criteria to make it clear that the demonstration cities program was a program for sections and neighborhoods suffering from social and economic tensions. And then we list them. It is not necessary for us to go through with them again. Your only objection to that this morning when Mr. Ashley raised this, as I recall, was that you were afraid that this language would present a situation whereby city X comes in to you with its second or third worst social tension area, and where you would have to say "No" to them, that you could consider only their worst.

Such was certainly not in the mind of Ashley, Moorhead, and Reuss in drafting this language. And I cannot find a phrase which conduces toward that interpretation of it.

Let me put to you this question. If this language is clearly purged of any suggestion that you cannot aid a second or third worst slum in a city, if that city elects to present it, and if it otherwise qualifies, if the language is cured of that alleged impediment, you would not oppose it?

Secretary WEAVER. Not at all. I don't think it is necessary, because I think if you read the criteria that we have, which is to provide low- and moderate-income housing in a substantial amount, to do certain of the social activities and solve certain of the social problems, to assist disadvantaged people back into the mainstream of society, with the emphasis that it has upon the disadvantaged, I think that the net result as you have interpreted your language and the language that is now in the bill would be exactly the same.

Mr. REUSS. I am delighted to hear that. Because to our mind, it is necessary to work out a program which has clear criteria and where