

get into these reviews and updating of the programs that they consult and take advantage of the experience of State and local agencies, because we think that point of view will provide a very significant input.

Title VI, again, to us is a very important provision which we hail in terms of a coordination and consolidation of grant-in-aid programs at the Federal level. It is at this point where we believe that local responsibility and initiative have to be really tested and not be merely words that are merely implied. We have suggested before other congressional committees that there be a radical change in the system in terms of Federal-local relations. I am thinking in terms of my own experience in the city government of Philadelphia, where as a department official in making requests for implementing programs, budget and otherwise, I appeared before city council committee once a year with a budget for programs. I was given not all that I asked for but at least approval of a program, and then I was permitted to go on my own.

In terms of Federal-local relations it does not work that way. Every step of the way requires another documentation, other evidence; it is reviewed not only in terms of a local review, but every local official has a parallel in the Federal scheme, whether he be a planner, appraiser, engineer, or a sight acquisition man. We think this is wasteful and unproductive.

We would, however, in terms of one of the provisions in title VI, in section 602(a) (1), suggest perhaps that there might be some flexibility in that administration not always be consolidated in a single agency. We think that there are some special situations where it might be wise to have more than one agency involved.

We welcome and applaud the provisions in title VII about notice to general local government and Federal Governments intent to acquire or dispose of land. We know in Philadelphia we have had so many difficulties with the General Services Administration or the military departments as they quickly make decisions on acquisitions and disposition of land which are frequently contrary to the whole program of the city of Philadelphia. In one case, a proposal for selling to the highest bidder, which would have greatly impaired our port, because someone bid for warehouses that were a port facility. So we think that this is a very helpful step.

Title VIII, if I may spend just a little bit more time, is a subject where our organization has a great deal of experience—the question of relocation. It so happens that purely by coincidence, my ability to return today was the fact that we in NAHRO had convened a 2-day workshop of people who actually carry out relocation in the Government agencies in the cities throughout the country.

They are meeting at this very moment in Washington to try to face up to some of the problems that are encompassed in the bill before you now. I had occasion this morning to point out to them that as relocation officials they have attempted to call to the community's attention the shortcomings of the program; that they as public officials have been in the vanguard of trying to reform it; and I go back to the 1930's in terms of low-rent public housing where these localities deliberately had programs partly on slum-cleared land, but also on vacant land, so that there might be room for the displaced low-income families.