

lected cities who will take advantage of existing Federal grant programs in a more efficient manner.

We respectfully suggest that it is time to stop attempting to spoon feed the Congress and the people in the area of Federal assistance to urban communities. We should recognize that a gap in local initiative cannot be bridged by money alone.

Perhaps if the Secretary first proceeds to implement section 4(c) of the Department act, he will discover that the shortcomings which he proposes to solve only with money are too fundamental for such a remedy.

The House Government Operations Committee is considering S. 561, a bill which passed the Senate last year and has as its purpose "to achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of grants-in-aid." S. 561 would not cost any money, hence lacks the drama associated with a gift of \$400 million a year to the cities which, in the Secretary's words, are "willing to face up to their responsibilities, willing to commit their energy and resources, willing to undertake actions which will have widespread and profound effects on the social and physical structure of the city."

H.R. 12946, THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Title I of this bill provides for added grants—up to 20 percent of project cost—for eight specific Federal grant-in-aid programs for those metropolitan areas which establish area-wide comprehensible planning and programming. These plans must be adequate for evaluating and guiding all public and private action of metropolitanwide or interjurisdictional significance.

This proposal is presently under study by the Realtors' Washington Committee, and I am therefore not prepared to make a specific recommendation to the subcommittee. However, our study to date prompts us to raise certain questions about the proposal.

First, I want to assure the subcommittee that we are cognizant of the shortcomings in metropolitanwide planning involving great numbers of separate and distinct corporate political entities within each of the 227 standard metropolitan statistical areas.

We note that urban planning grants involving \$31.1 million have been approved for 408 metropolitan and regional areas, as well as 88 projects involving \$12.3 million for statewide agencies. The Secretary's testimony did not give an evaluation of these but the subcommittee might request such an evaluation in determining the need for a new metropolitan planning grant program to be superimposed over the existing one.

Under this title the county, municipality, or other general-purpose unit of local government, to qualify for the grant, must satisfy the Secretary that its land-use controls, zoning codes, and subdivision regulations, unrelated to the project qualifying for the added grant, are effectively assisting in and conforming to metropolitan planning and programming. The Secretary in his testimony on February 28 disclaims any desire to promote so-called metro forms of government, yet we wonder what would be the nature of the assurances which would satisfy the Secretary; and what would be the recourse of the Department should the public body receiving the grant fail, at some subsequent time, to meet its obligations.