

areas we do not think it proper to overlook the fact that much which is good has been accomplished in our urban areas to date. We think it would be a serious mistake to assume that Federal activities are responsible for all that good. Federal programs have indeed made some major contributions, but so too have local governments and private enterprises.

We are aware that urban areas, composed as they are so frequently of a number of diverse political entities, suffer major growing pains. But we are not convinced that those pains are so bad that it can be categorically stated that our cities, in which the bulk of our population and wealth are already contained, "do not have adequate resources to deal effectively with the critical problems facing them." We submit that the great reservoir of wealth and technical knowledge, upon which even the Federal Government must rely, is in our urban areas now. These are the resources upon which we must draw to solve our urban problems. The problem we face is how best to mobilize them.

If I can depart for a second from the text here, there are many examples in California, such as the Irvine Ranch, Rancho San Bernardo, involving planned areas around new university campuses, where city staffs, State staffs, and university staffs, have all cooperated in outlining the planned module for the new community. The thing that somewhat impresses me is that under this program we would be pulling in, unquestionably, these people, putting them on the Federal payroll and superimposing them on top of others who would then replace them and do the necessary work that they are already doing.

In so saying, we do not close our eyes to the fact that real problems do exist—problems which are deserving of major efforts. We are gratified, for example, to note the attention devoted to the social problems of the slum dweller. We firmly believe that part of the solution to the slum problem lies in renewing the hopes, ambitions, and capabilities of the residents. Experience has shown that it frequently takes more to rehabilitate people than standard housing if they have no real confidence in their own future.

We agree, too, that improved code enforcement, more widespread appreciation of the values of planning and zoning, and improved coordination of efforts between political jurisdictions in the metropolitan area are all desirable. We do not agree that the problems so overshadow the accomplishments that we should yield local authority to Federal officials. Both of these bills require the Secretary's approval, not only of plans, but of their administration. How can approvals be obtained without yielding to the Secretary's demands?

H.R. 12341 is actually vague regarding the authority of the Federal coordinator, but H.R. 12946 would establish the Secretary with authority over an extensive scope of activity throughout the standard metropolitan statistical area, and such extension as he determines to be appropriate. We do not believe it appropriate to grant such broad authority to any official. This is our major objection to these bills.

However, we feel that H.R. 12341 has another serious deficiency. Its principal purpose seems to be to demonstrate what can be done if enough Federal programs and enough Federal money are available.