

S. 698 and the related legislation upon which these hearings are based, are attempts to provide at least a start to better intergovernmental cooperation. Most of the titles and legislative language are familiar to a majority of the members of this committee.

The titles of S. 698 providing for improved administration of grants to the States, periodic congressional review of grants, provision for Federal technical services to the State and local governments, a coordinated Federal urban assistance policy and an urban land utilization policy were passed by the Senate in the last Congress and were in varying forms the subjects of extensive hearings going back to the 87th Congress. The same is true of S. 458 and S. 735, dealing with congressional review.

Title VIII of S. 698, making relocation payments and assistance available to persons and businesses displaced by Federal or federally assisted programs, and title IX, providing for a uniform land acquisition policy, are similar to S. 1681, which also passed the Senate in the last Congress and which includes additional language based on S. 1201 on which hearings were held in the 89th Congress. This legislation came out of the recommendation contained in a special study on the problems of real property acquisitions conducted by a select subcommittee of the House.

The entirely new legislation in S. 698 involves title VI, providing a method for the consolidation of Federal grant programs, and my amendment to the bill which would add a new title X providing for improved coordination in the accounting, auditing and reporting of Federal assistance programs.

With so much of this legislation previously heard and agreed upon on the Senate side, the question might be raised: why additional hearings? Why not move it up and out?

First, we have two new members who, from the beginning of their assignment to the committee, have exhibited an active interest in intergovernmental problems and will have, I am sure, a special interest in the subject matter of S. 698.

Second, the accelerating problems faced by our State and local governments—in riots and tension; in expanding urbanization; in utilizing Federal aid programs, and in developing meaningful planning—make a new look at this legislation mandatory.

Third, although we have labored diligently during the past few years to perfect the legislative language and to incorporate workable concepts, the recent proliferation of studies in the field of Federal-State-local relations give us justification for reviewing the latest thinking on these subjects, particularly with respect to assisting persons and businesses displaced by Federal programs.

Fourth, we have before us also S. 458 and S. 735, which propose somewhat different approaches to the objective of periodic congressional review of grant-in-aid programs. These need to be considered along with the corresponding provisions of S. 698.

Finally, we shall be taking testimony on S. 2981, an entirely new bill, but closely related to the other legislation we are considering. This is the Joint Funding Simplification Act of 1968, introduced by Senator McClellan at the request of the administration, to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance