

Mr. WISE. The point that I am making is that you are beginning to develop a tool that is made up of many sticks, and that the Highway Planning Act is one of them. There is a very similar requirement, almost precisely the same kind of thing that now pertains to the expenditures of funds under the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1964.

Now, I say, with the Highway Act we are beginning to get some dialog, we are beginning to see that perhaps our thoughts on just highway planning were not broad enough. We are on the way to achieving dialog, communication and a great deal of understanding in the metropolitan area. If you would rather leave the act the way that it is, in terms of consistency with metropolitan planning, at the present time this would be fine, provided that the development of the demonstrations program was a part of the cities' comprehensive planning process. The objection that I was raising is that rather than saying that it should be consistent with a plan, we feel that it should be developed as a part of the plan. Now, if you want to leave it consistent with the metropolitan plan, but indicate that it should be a part of the comprehensive planning process within the city, this would, I think, overcome your objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Moorhead and Mr. Ashley and I have proposed an additional criterion by way of amendment to the demonstration cities program of the administration which would require a workable program, which means communitywide, before you could get a demonstration grant. And that would meet at least part of your point, would not it?

Mr. WISE. Yes; it would.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you.

I do have one more short question.

I enjoyed your whole testimony, and particularly about new towns. I wonder if you have noticed as I did that whereas the State ownership part of the new towns proposal requires multi-income communities, the mortgage insurance portion does not. Don't you think the good planning for State-owned new towns is equally important for mortgage insurance to new towns?

Mr. WISE. If I were drawing the legislation, I would certainly draw it that way, Mr. Reuss, very definitely.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Reuss.

Mr. Wise, you have been a very informative witness here this afternoon. We have been very glad to have had you and your associate here.

The committee will recess until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 2:23 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Monday, March 7, 1966.)