

grams and established a single authorization, appropriation and set of requirements. Under it, the States are given considerable discretion in developing their own health services in light of their own special needs.

Second, President Johnson in his March 1967 message on "The Quality of Government" announced that he requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to review the range of Federal grant-in-aid programs to determine additional areas where consolidation should be taken. Pursuant to this Presidential directive, top level HEW officials have been working with the Bureau of the Budget in analyzing possibilities of further consolidations in HEW administered programs.

Third, this year two additional consolidating measures were introduced by the Administration for Congressional consideration: the proposed Partnership in Earning and Learning Act (S. 3099 and H.R. 15066) and the proposed Consolidation of the Educational Opportunity Grant, National Defense Student Loan, and Work Study Programs (Section 402 of S. 3098 and H.R. 15067).

To date then, grant consolidation has followed the normal course of the legislative process. A major rationale for this approach is that combining grants involves changing varying legislative requirements concerning allocation formulas, matching ratios, as well as the basic responsibility of Congress for determining the direction of Federal funds to achieve special and national objectives. The principal defects of this method are of a political and more practical nature. First, middle management administrators at both the State and Federal levels frequently are unfriendly to departmental efforts to consolidate programs which they administer. Second, special interests which usually attach themselves to the grant aided functions frequently set up political obstacles to Congressional efforts which threaten to upset the grant-in-aid status quo. Third, the practical problems imposed by the complexity and divergent program goals of the existing grant structure hinder the formulation and effective implementation of workable consolidations. These factors combine to hinder both departmental and Congressional endeavors to achieve grant consolidations through the normal legislative process.

The approach embodied in Title VI is geared to overcoming some of these obstacles. Under it, the President would submit grant consolidation plans to Congress under procedures similar to those used for administrative reorganization plans and this would place primary responsibility for this effort in the Executive Office of the President. A plan would become effective at the end of ninety (90) calendar days of continuous session of Congress following its transmittal, unless either House passed a resolution disapproving the proposed consolidation. Each plan would involve a consolidation of individual programs within the same functional area and would focus administrative responsibility in one Federal agency, specify the formula or formulas for making the grant, and describe the differences between the new formula and those under each of the previous individual programs.

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 demonstrate the constitutionality of this device.

The Advisory Commission in its massive study of Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System recommended a drastic decrease in the number of separate authorizations for Federal grants and specifically sanctioned the method set forth in this title as a means of furthering this objective.

Title VII: Title VII amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act by stipulating a uniform procedure for 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. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities have adopted specific resolutions calling for this title and it is wholly consistent with the findings and recommendations in the Commission's report on the Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning.

Under the provisions of this title, the GSA Administrator in disposing of Federal urban land holdings, shall, to the extent practicable, give advance notice to