

program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects and for other purposes. This raises some of the questions we would like to explore in these hearings.

S. 698 has 10 prospective titles and a great number of separate sections. It is, in fact, an omnibus bill. We welcome comments and suggestions on any and all parts of the bill, but I hope the witnesses will make a special attempt to cover some of what we consider to be the more significant current issues.

In title II, we provide for grant information to the States. What is the most effective means of channeling usable information to Governors and legislators concerning the impact and scope of Federal programs?

To what degree have the Bureau of the Budget and the Federal agencies coordinated their resources to provide this information?

The President's message on the quality of American Government and various executive orders have stressed the need for a free flow of information of this kind and we shall be interested to learn what new approaches can be used.

Title II also gives a permissive waiver to the single State agency concept. What has been the degree to which this requirement has tended to weaken executive power and leadership in State and local development programs, and how has it added to the difficulties of program coordination and planning?

In title III, permitting Federal technical assistance, we made a special attempt to improve the legislative language to meet the concern of private interests also providing special and technical services to State and local governments. Were our changes adequate, and are further changes needed to assure private enterprise an appropriate role in helping to improve our Federal system?

Title IV, although general in its language, is one of the most far-reaching requirements in the bill. It is a congressional mandate for a Federal intergovernmental coordination policy with respect to grant administration in urban development.

In view of what we now know of the urban crisis, is the language of title IV properly geared to present needs? Does it lead in the direction of a national policy that takes into account the need for balanced development of both urban and rural areas? Does it provide for coordination on the full scale necessary if national, regional, State and local priorities are all to be fairly served?

This is the delicate balance of federalism. I have suggested a special "working secretariat" in the Office of the President, a National Intergovernmental Affairs Council, to speak for the President in hammering out this policy. That legislation is not a part of this bill; but this title deals with the same problem.

Title V concerns congressional review of future Federal grant programs. So also do S. 458 and S. 735. This idea has been with us for a long time, but there has been continuing opposition to some of the language we have used, particularly with reference to the provision for expiration after 5 years of grant programs hereafter approved without a termination date.

In title VI, we have a new approach to coping with the proliferation of Federal grants which, in some cases, has caused confusion in the Federal system.