

for the city of Philadelphia, and in that capacity as the mayor's top assistant in the field of long-range development for the city.

I was also the director of the local Redevelopment Authority and, therefore, had direct supervision over some programs, including land acquisition and relocation, and a broader supervisory role for other programs, including public housing, code enforcement, and so on, related to housing and development.

During that period I served as a member of the Pennsylvania Advisory Commission which revised the eminent domain laws of the State of Pennsylvania and I note that many of the, or a number of the provisions in S. 698, are not unlike those that we put into the present Pennsylvania eminent domain code.

Our statement pretty well represents the NAHRO point of view. We do want to express our appreciation to the subcommittee and to you, Mr. Chairman, on the hearings, on creative Federalism last year and the sponsorship of S. 698. We think that they are real milestones in trying to understand intergovernmental relations.

We, of course, in NAHRO, who represent local government officials, believe very strongly, and we think our experience backs us up, in local responsibility and initiative. These are words that appear in so many of the Federal programs for which Federal assistance has been provided.

And I have submitted, as part of the record on Tuesday, a summary of a statement which I submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Housing which emphasizes this point. We feel quite strongly that if the programs are to work, including some of the wonderful ideas in S. 698 and S. 2981, that there has to be perhaps a more radical revision of the relation between Federal agencies and localities.

And I might want to say just a word or two more about that when we come to one of the other titles in S. 698.

Getting to the bill, itself, we certainly endorse the basic concepts and principles, such as those in title II for a more flexible administration of Federal grant-in-aid to the States. I would like to note, by the way, that although that title talks about relations between Federal and State and local governments that there are some situations, such as those in Philadelphia, where the metropolitan areas go across State lines. We have three States within the metropolitan area. And in terms of trying to achieve efficiency and flexibility, the need for contracts and compacts and negotiations with three State legislatures gets to be very cumbersome; we are hopeful in terms of this flexible administration idea that a look will be taken at that specific problem as well.

We endorse the technical assistance provision in title III by the Federal Government and to State and local agencies.

We endorse the title IV in terms of the provisions to relate federally aided urban development activities to comprehensive local planning. We believe that this is extremely important, particularly in terms of both local and regional planning, and also that in regional planning, State governments can play a very important role.

It is in title V that we have a very strong endorsement of the provisions of the bill to have a systematic review of the Federal aid programs by Congress. Specifically, we would like to see some language in section 503 that when substantive committees of the Congress