

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 practical matter and if the past is any guide, few grants-in-aid would be affected by this termination provision. Our staff analysis of recently enacted grant programs indicates that Congress as a matter of course now provides expiration dates for almost all grant programs. Of the 41 enactments of new or expanded grant programs in 1965, all but three contained expiration or other limiting provisions (the three include: USDA's program for Water Works and Sewage Plants in Rural Areas, and two programs authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1965). 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.

With reference to the final three sections of Title V we agree with the position taken earlier by the Bureau of the Budget and others that Section 504, which calls for studies by the Comptroller General of Federal grant-in-aid programs, would simply give greater focus to the efforts of GAO and would result in a better servicing of the needs of the reviewing committees. It is our belief that the Comptroller General now has the authority to undertake the mission assigned to him by this section. Similarly, the role assigned to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations under Section 505, while creating possible budgetary problems, certainly is within the Commission's present mandate "to make available technical assistance to executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in their review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the federal system." The question raised in the 1965 hearings as to a possible conflict regarding the role of Federal executive members on the Commission appears to lack much substance, since any member of the Commission is always at liberty to dissent to or abstain from recommendations adopted by the majority. Finally, the GAO records and audit authority stipulated in Section 506 is simply in accord with good fiscal management practices. Most grant-in-aid legislation contains such provisions, but the general authority provided would remove any ambiguities concerning GAO's power in those few instances where it is lacking.

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 administrative problems at all levels of government. Your "Creative Federalism" hearings as well as those of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization clearly reveal the detrimental impact of such factors as the lack of information concerning sources of available funds, the overlapping and duplication among functional programs, and the inflexibility of many separate funds and requirements on capacity of both administrators and elected officials to effectively execute, coordinate and evaluate grant-in-aid programs.

Consolidation then is a top priority item on practically everybody's check list on how to strengthen the grant-in-aid system. Unfortunately, consolidation is far easier to orate about, than to achieve. Certain encouraging steps, however, have been taken at the Federal level to achieve greater rationality in the maze of programs by grant consolidations.

First, under the leadership of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which administers approximately half of the grant programs, the Comprehensive Public Health Planning and Public Health Services amendments (Partnership in Health Act) were developed and subsequently enacted by Congress. This Act consolidates several previously separate categorical pro-