Committee On the Organization of the Congress and closely resembles the proposed amendment (Section 136 (b) and (c)) to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190 d) contained in Section 105(a) of S. 355 (90th Congress). Second, Section 4(b)(3) requires that each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives submit not later than March 31 of each year reports on their review activities of the preceding calendar year. This section parallels the proposed amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Section 136(d)) appearing under Section 105(a) of S. 355.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has found that grants-in-aid to State and local governments have been and are the National government's principal mechanism for securing intergovernmental collaboration in accomplishing national legislative objectives. As you know, reliance on the grant device has increased significantly during the past few years. With this have come mounting problems of fragmentation, manageability, and coordination.

In view of the paramount position of Federal grants in the American system of intergovernmental relations, the Advisory Commission believes that the efficacy, value and public acceptability of this mechanism must be safeguarded and that its usefulness as a collaborative device be strengthened. More than six years ago the Commission was struck by the widespread concern over the deficiencies in existing legislative procedures pertaining to grants, especially as related to determining those grants that had achieved their initial objectives and to redirecting others to reflect developments subsequent to their enactment.

On May 25, 1960, the ACIR placed the subject of periodic review of Federal grants-in-aid on its work program and subsequently at its June 15, 1961 meeting the Commission adopted a report entitled *Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-In-Aid To State and Local Governments*. This report was made part of the record of the hearings on S. 2114 in the 88th Congress. It spells out in depth the Commission's recommendation for systematic review. This recommendation would be implemented by the enactment of S. 458, S. 735, or Title V of S. 698.

The Commission position has consistently been that there is a need for general legislation providing for systematic review and assessment of grants-in-aid. This should not be interpreted to mean that Federal grant-in-aid programs under current congressional and administrative processes go unreviewed. The executive agencies involved are giving closer and closer attention to the operation of their programs and requests for grant funds are subject to the usual scrutiny of the appropriation processes in Congress. Moreover, the legislative oversight committees exercise surveillance with respect to grants coming within their jurisdiction. In general, however, the review and redirection of grants are treated unsystematically and on an uncoordinated basis. The findings of the Joint Committee On the Organization of the Congress in this area only confirms these earlier ACIR recommendations.

The Commission position is, therefore, that the proposed legislation would be beneficial on a number of counts. It would stimulate development of more uniform criteria with which Congressional committees could critically assess the effectiveness of grants-in-aid in important subject matter fields. Equally significant is the provision for systematic committee review since it would give State and local governments a regular forum for voicing their views concerning the problems that have arisen in connection with the administration of individual grant programs. Further, the five year termination provision relating to certain future grants is a salutory feature of the legislation. Much confusion has arisen concerning this issue, but it should be pointed out that this section obviously would in no way affect those grants that have a termination date or those that have been specifically exempted from its application. In short, the termination provision merely affects those few programs each session that Congress fails to designate as short-term or long-term undertakings. In such instances, the Commission feels that the five year termination provision, along with the review process that in most instances would result from it, would be helpful.

With reference to Sections 4, 5, and 6 of S. 458, and to Sections 504 and 505 of S. 698, the Advisory Commission has taken no formal position. The first three embody amendments which were adopted by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during its deliberations on S. 2114, in the 88th Congress and which appeared in Title II of S. 561 in the 89th Congress as it was enacted by the Senate.

As in the case of the above, the Commission has taken no formal position with reference to the review specialist and annual report provisions of S. 735. These subsections do not appear to conflict with the Commission's basic recommenda-