

assistance may well exceed the \$37 billion mark—or twice the 1961 level. These figures, it should be noted, are based on the projected extent of Federal financial obligations or commitments to communities of 2500 or more and include insurance and guaranteed loans.

The greatest growth in urban-oriented grants have occurred in the areas of education, housing and community development, and programs to better the position of the disadvantaged. They include grants that go directly to the local communities involved as well as those to States which subsequently are channeled to or benefit urban communities.

The need for coordination and improved intergovernmental relations is clearly greatest in our metropolitan areas where, according to the 1967 Census of Governments, the fragmentation and overlapping of governmental jurisdictions is accelerating. Title IV offers some procedures for assisting the various levels of government operating directly or indirectly in such areas to work together to solve common problems. It authorizes the President to establish government-wide guides for the formulation, evaluation, and review of Federal urban development programs and projects (Section 401). It also provides as a matter of Congressional policy, that agencies—to the maximum extent possible—will take into account all viewpoints—national, State, regional, and local—in the formulation and valuation of such programs and projects (Section 401). Moreover, systematic planning required by several individual Federal-urban programs shall—again, to the extent possible—be coordinated with and made part of comprehensive local and areawide urban development planning (Section 401).

A special feature of our federal system is that most types of domestic public services are administered by general local governments—cities, counties, and towns. Yet, special districts in the United States are growing at a rapid rate. From 1962 to 1967, these units experienced a 16 percent increase, reaching a total of more than 21,000. It is the Commission's belief that where Federal grant-in-aid legislation makes both special purpose local governments and units of general local governments eligible to receive urban development loans and grants, Federal agencies should favor the latter, in absence of substantial reasons to the contrary. Section 402 of this title implements this goal.

Title V: Title V of S. 698 has a lengthy legislative history dating back to the 7th Congress. It provides a uniform policy and procedure for Congressional review of future grants-in-aid to States and local units of government. In those cases where no expiration date for grant authority is specified by law and where such grants are not specifically exempted from the provisions of Section 502, five-year termination date is stipulated.

Strangely enough, there is still considerable confusion concerning the purposes and provisions of this title. Its basic purpose is to assure that new grant-in-aid programs will be revised and redirected, as necessary, to meet growing and changing needs which they were originally designed to support.

Grants-in-aid, as was noted at the outset, constitute the Federal Government's principal weapon for accomplishing national legislative goals in the domestic arena, while at the same time maximizing intergovernmental cooperation and reliance on grassroots of governmental administration. Yet, one perennial criticism made of Federal grant programs is that once established they tend to continue of their own accord without substantial modification, even when the circumstances that prompted their establishment have changed or disappeared. The need for systematic reassessment of grant-in-aid programs is especially important in a period of rapid urbanization and technological change, such as we are now experiencing.

The Advisory Commission in its report on Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments (1961), and the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization in one of its major findings clearly underscored the need for this title. As a matter of fact, it serves as excellent complementary legislation to Section 105 of the proposed Congressional Reorganization Act (S. 355 and H.R. 2595) which authorizes "review analysts" for each of the major standing committees of Congress.

With reference to the five-year termination provision in this title which has occasioned so much debate and little agreement, the following points should be noted:

- It obviously does not apply to those future grant-in-aid programs that would have a termination date;

- It would not apply to grants wherein Congress had waived application of this termination provision; and