

liberal and conservative in their leanings—it was hard to get them to work together. I think the commuter transportation problem in Philadelphia has become outstanding because of this effort. But it took a lot of local initiative on the part of these different political subdivisions, and the ones with the most initiative worked with the ones with less initiative.

These local cooperation programs, good or bad, depend on the competency of the local politicians and the administrators. It is very—a very hard thing to answer, I will admit, but it can be done, and it can be done without any Federal intervention as it did in this case.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I think, sir, throughout the years, there is a tendency on the part of Washington—and this is not criticism of this administration, the same thing happened during the Eisenhower administration—of trying to push this money out to the communities and not make the communities measure up to their own responsibilities. I think for many years the workable program was something that a mayor could dictate to his secretary some afternoon and send in. And I think that considerable apathy developed in the communities and the rush was on to get the money and they would come to Congress and cry about the redtape and Congressmen are always sympathetic to local officials who are not getting the money fast enough. I think that this is the source of considerable difficulty; I think we should have made it tough on the communities to qualify for these Federal grants-in-aid and should have made them adopt minimum housing codes, enforce the codes, and now we are waking up to the fact that these omissions on the part of local officials result in the program not meeting the goals that we talked about over the years.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If I understand the thrust of your testimony as far as answering this complaint about the local initiative gap, you recommend, not that we provide more in the way of the carrot, but a little more in the way of the stick, would that be correct?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is right.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Thank you very much.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. St Germain?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I certainly appreciate your testimony this morning. A good part of it is constructive. Yet, I am overwhelmed. I do not mean that in a derogatory manner, but I do not think that you gentlemen have grasped at all and come to the understanding that we on the committee have come to after almost 2 weeks of hearings, as to the technique that is to be used here, because you cite the facts, for instance, that a limit has been put on the amount of urban renewal for each of the next 4 years. Also, on public housing. True, that is a fact. But the 80 percent of the funds here are to be utilized for more programs that are not covered by Federal grants. So that the incentives here are not nearly—in my opinion it goes further than just all of a sudden push a great deal of Federal money into the local city treasury. It gives existing Federal programs—it exists for these programs but it gives the particular community—makes funds available to it, extra funds to work on programs that they probably would not be able to get to for many, many years. We complain a great deal about Uncle Sam trying to do so much for the local communities. Mr. Emlen states that he was on a board of commissioners. You were a member of local government. I do not know what the financial