

It would not apply to grants wherein Congress had waived application of this termination provision.

It would apply only to those grants which Congress—for some reason or other—failed to designate as ongoing or short run programs.

As a technical matter and if the past is any guide, few grants-in-aid would be affected by this termination provision. Of the 30 major grant-in-aid enactments in 1966, only four contained no expiration provision (air pollution control maintenance, the nonfood assistance program under the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, the national trust historical preservation legislation, and assistance for housing in Alaska). Of the 17 enacted during the first session of the 90th Congress (1967), only one had no expiration provision (Meat Inspection Act). Finally, of the four passed thus far in this session, only one, (child welfare services under the social security amendments) lacks such a provision. We would like to submit for the record a list of grant-in-aid programs enacted during the period 1961–April 1968, showing the extent to which specific expiration dates have been provided. This table should allay the fears of those who view section 502 of S. 698 with alarm.

Title VI: This title constitutes an entirely new departure from the previous legislation and is designed to overcome the proliferation of Federal grant programs by authorizing the President to submit to Congress plans for the consolidation of individual categories within broad functional areas. Such authority would be subject to the type of congressional veto that presently applies to executive reorganization plans. It is almost superfluous, Mr. Chairman, to declare to this subcommittee that the proliferation of Federal grants has created serious fiscal and administration problems at all levels of government.

Some opponents of this “reorganizational plan approach” have contended that it involves an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority to the executive branch. We are convinced—and various authorities support us—that the issues involved in this argument differ in no respect from those that apply to the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. Thus, far, the latter has been voted by Congress on seven different occasions and renewal is again pending. Congress’ action then, along with court cases upholding the validity of the act, clearly demonstrates the constitutionality of this device.

Title VII: Title VII amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act by stipulating a uniform procedure for the acquisition, use and disposition of land within urban areas by the General Services Administration in conformance, to the extent possible, with local governments’ planning and land use goals.

Federal land acquisition disposal practices in urban areas clearly have a significant impact on local schools, water and sewage services, highways and streets and other local governmental functions. At present, there is no formal Federal policy with respect to these practices, in contrast to the planning requirements in several grant programs that seek to strengthen local and areawide planning and land-use regulations.

Furthermore, the testimony on March 8, 1967 of Mr. Boyd L. Rasmussen, Director of Interior’s Bureau of Land Management, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee would indicate that Bureau of Land Manage-