

three names for him, some call him a commissar, and some call him a czar. Now, I don't believe this. And I think that the bill is clear that he would not have dictatorial powers. But I would like to ask you these two questions: First, would the people who have such fears feel better, do you think, if we renamed this Federal official a local coordinator rather than a Federal coordinator?

Second, what do you think of the idea of making the services of the coordinator optional to participating cities rather than mandatory as now provided in the bill, H.R. 12341?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, my answer to your first question would be that I do not think it makes any difference at all what you call him. If a locality is geared up properly, is moving quickly and with sound planning, and executes its programs after careful planning, and executes them with skill and determination, you probably do not need any coordinator. If a community is weak in this regard, a coordinator can be of great service and help. It may come down, in the last analysis, as to how expert he is, how good he is. If he is simply a shuffler of papers in the line of bureaucracy, it won't add a thing. If he is a powerful fellow that knows the community deeply, that knows its complexities and its pressures, and is a mover and doer himself, it can be of great value to a community that needs that kind of assistance.

As to the second question, I would think that option would be desirable.

Perhaps Mr. Logue would like to add something to this.

Mr. LOGUE. I agree with those comments. The role is still largely undefined, and its significance will be determined by the grant formula you finally adopt, and the extent to which the Secretary requires commitments. So if he is too extensive in his requirements for commitments you might need several coordinators.

I think the biggest thing that I have concern about here is the need for more simplicity in the legislation.

Mr. BARRETT. May I just conclude on this. On the basis that the locality has the need of a coordinator, what would be your answer on an optional basis, or mandatory?

Mr. LINDSAY. I would say optional.

Mr. ST GERMAN. Mr. Chairman, would you yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I have a half minute.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I was just going to ask this.

Mr. Mayor, in your testimony one of the concerns you express is the fact that 90 percent of all Federal programs should be paid for, using that formula, in order to do away with this bureaucracy and redtape. By the same token a Federal coordinator, if they read Secretary Weaver's testimony on Monday, his function would be to expedite the approval of these programs. And I am wondering if the mayor and his assistant had this in mind in answering your question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would say, as I originally said, that if the locality is geared up, and is working well with the Washington administrators, you may not need it. There is no point in adding an additional person just for the sake of adding an additional person. I think it depends on each area as to whether or not a coordinator could be really effective. And it also depends on the coordinator.