

review periods, and contracts came up. There was a very illuminating discussion as to its validity. We have lived as we have learned and we have learned as we have lived.

Here you come to a situation in a rapidly changing world where we ought to be taking a look at these things to see whether they are up to date, whether there are new problems, and whether mistakes have been made which can be corrected legislatively, whether omissions occurred at the time the legislation was passed. The attitude of some of the people in the administrative agencies, that all of the creative thinking and all new ideas terminated when we wrote the bill, seems to me to be utterly indefensible. I cannot understand why they persist. I am glad you pointed out so effectively that that attitude is not a defensible one.

Now, a question or two on the testimony of Mr. Hughes, which you have studied and read. The one part about this legislation which concerns me, though I am a cosponsor, is the use of the Reorganization Act technique in title VI. I think Mr. Hughes makes a perfectly valid point when he implied that restricting the reorganization procedure regarding consolidations involves changes in formula and other substantive law which are naturally the function of the legislative body. It seems to me we might have to give this pretty serious thought, Mr. Chairman, and figure out how these changes can be made in the normal legislative procedures, rather than running the clock backwards and utilizing the reorganization process and procedure to virtually write new legislation.

I would like to have your comments on that.

Mr. COLMAN. Well, Senator Mundt, I think it depends upon the distinction between the end and the means. If the Congress wants grant consolidation, if the Congress wants these 400 or more separate grant programs reduced, if you want to bring that situation under control, an effective tool for doing that is provided in the title suggested here. Admittedly, just as in the case of the Reorganization Act, there is some delegation of the initiative from the Congress to the Executive. But I think that the Congress, in its action on the Reorganization Act back in 1949, felt that the end justified the means, that you would get more reorganization and that you would get a more effective grouping of agencies by lessening the legislative hurdles and roadblocks that these programs would have to encounter in order to become effective.

Now, we all know of and you referred a minute ago, Senator, to the number of advocates of these individual grant-in-aid programs. They are numerous, and they are powerful, and they will not be moved. When you bring up a consolidation proposal that has to run through the regular legislative gamut—if they are able to achieve in action at any one spot along the line, just as the folks have over in the House about the legislative reorganization bill—they have it made. They have stopped the consolidation.

This approach admittedly assigns initiative to the Executive, but the Congress retains the veto power, and the proponents of grant fragmentation could no longer be victorious though achieving legislative inaction. They would have to muster a majority of votes in one House or the other of the Congress in order to block a grant consolidation plan.

So those are the very compelling reasons that the members of the