

ment, and the manner in which it has been defined by regulation, has created some problems in the States. The section authorizing Federal departments and agencies to waive this requirement and approve other forms of administrative organization is heartily endorsed.

The title permitting Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized or technical services to State and local units of government properly reflects the partnership needed in strengthening the service features of all levels of government, and the Governors again lend their support to this concept.

The National Governors' Conference has in the past gone on record supporting the general provisions in the act calling for development of a national urban systems policy for coordinating machinery among Federal departments and between the Federal Government and other levels of government.

Also with the increased pace of State planning activities in the last few years, the section calling for full consideration of "all viewpoints—national, regional, State, and local" in planning urban development programs is even more significant and necessary. The provision of this section of the act favoring units of general local government as recipients for Federal grants-in-aid is wise, and, as a matter of good governmental policy, general-purpose governments rather than existing or proposed special districts should be encouraged to undertake those tasks which they can perform.

While generally supporting the philosophy underlying the title dealing with acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies, it was urged by the Governors in their 1965 testimony that the provisions of this title be extended to rural areas where they are or might be practical.

The Governors are also on record in support of the periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to the States and to local units of government. We believe it to be a matter of simple prudence to provide for periodic congressional review and examination of grants-in-aid as well as other types of legislation. An excellent first step in this area would provide for congressional review in new programs every 5 years, unless the program had a termination date. If the program were limited, then it could be reexamined before extension.

Turning now to the new titles found in S. 698, I and the conference endorse the concept of consolidation of grants-in-aid programs. Consolidation, on the scale required, will not be easy. There will be pressures from both within and without Government to maintain the present proliferation and categorization of grants-in-aid programs.

The conference, in a study by the State Urban Relations Committee, published in October 1967, addresses itself to this problem, and I quote:

A basic consolidation in the number of categorical grants-in-aid must be undertaken by the Federal Government. To the maximum extent possible, categorical grants within the same functional area should be consolidated into a single program, with a single set of statutory requirements and a single authorization and appropriation and be administered by a single Federal agency. It is quite feasible that the number of separate grant authorizations can be reduced by half the present number without sacrifice of essential national priorities in the provision of financial assistance to the States and localities.

In order to facilitate meaningful consolidation of grants-in-aid, Congress should pass enabling legislation to allow the President to submit consolidation plans. After due consideration in Congress and without negative resolution, the proposed consolidation would become effective.