

proved involving approximately \$23 million, and 232 GNRPs have been approved involving \$128 million.

The programs have been repeatedly nurtured by annual housing and appropriations bills and the record is silent as to their shortcomings, if any. Now the Department of Housing and Urban Development tells us that these planning programs, along with the many grant-in-aid programs such as urban renewal, are insufficient and that something dramatic is needed—a bold new course of action—to induce the cities to exploit existing Federal programs more zealously. The antidote is more money—this time an approximate \$400 million per year over each of the next 6 years.

Let us examine for a moment what this \$2.3 billion will do. The Secretary, on page 2 of his detailed statement filed with the subcommittee, advises that the money will provide for “massive additions to the supply of decent, low- and moderate-income housing.”

How will this be accomplished when none of the basic housing statutes involving low- and moderate-income housing is amended by this bill? Will it provide more public housing? It cannot because Congress last year fixed the annual rate of unit authorizations. Will it provide more section 221(d)(3) below-market-rate housing for moderate-income families? No, because FNMA special assistance authorization is fixed by prior law. Will it provide more rent supplement projects? Here, too, the Congress last year approved a level of activity for the next 4 years—a level which is not disturbed by this bill.

The Federal grant-in-aid programs qualifying under this bill amount to approximately 70. According to the Seventh Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 25 new Federal grant programs, or major expansions of existing programs, were enacted by the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Thus the Congress has been most generous in its approach to Federal grant-in-aid programs. The authorizations for these are not increased by this bill, yet \$400 million per year is being offered as an inducement to exploit these programs more zealously and more efficiently.

When the Congress last year created the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the new Department received a mandate to create a Director of Urban Program Coordination who—

shall develop recommendations relating to the administration of Federal programs affecting such problems, particularly with respect to achieving effective cooperation among the Federal, State, and local agencies concerned.

Now the Department, for all practical purposes, came into existence when the Secretary was confirmed by the Senate on January 17. Ten days later the Department requested this legislation to pump more than \$2 billion to achieve a degree of activity and coordination which the Congress last year thought could be accomplished through other and less costly administrative devices.

We wonder what would have been the reaction of the Congress last year if section 4(c) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act had included a third clause so as to read:

Subject to the direction of the Secretary, the Director shall, in carrying out his responsibility, (1) establish and maintain close liaison with the Federal departments and agencies concerned and (2) consult with State, local, and regional officials and consider their recommendations with respect to such programs and (3)—and here are my words—disburse \$400 million per year to se-