

But there is another anomaly. If land for educational facilities is acquired through urban renewal and turned over to an institution, relocation benefits are provided.

This has happened in a minority of cases. The University of Chicago is one.

If on one block in a city, a university expands through the use of Federal urban renewal funds, the families and businesses displaced receive relocation compensation. But, if in the next block, which is not part of an urban renewal plan, the same university purchases buildings which it intends to demolish for the construction of classrooms using Federal grants or loans, families and businesses displaced are not compensated.

My bill would essentially extend the benefits of section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to relocation payments to construction under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

What it does is to bring to people who are displaced under your legislation the same benefits that those people would get if they were displaced under urban renewal action.

The text of the bill is before the committee. I have one suggested change in it which I could take up with counsel or cite here very briefly.

On page 2 of that bill, line 6, I would add language after the word "displacement," which will read "and other relocation adjustment payments," making it perfectly clear that all the benefits of section 114 of the Housing Act of 1949 would be available.

I will not relate what those benefits are because they are available to the committee. They are spelled out in the act and in my full statement.

I urge then that, as you consider amending the Higher Education Facilities Act, you take cognizance of this very real problem which exists in any area, whether it is a major city or a small town, where vacant land is not available and where a college or university acquires land in order to construct facilities under your act, and the result is the dislocation of people and businesses.

This is a very serious problem, and I think in all equity that individuals so affected ought to have at least the same benefits that they have under the urban renewal program.

I am glad to expand on this in any way the members of the committee desire.

(Congressman Ryan's statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

I am pleased to appear in support of H.R. 1248, which I introduced to guarantee relocation payments for persons and businesses displaced as a result of construction under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Grants and loans have steadily increased since the inception of this program. In FY 1967, \$787,895,000 was allocated (\$537,053,000 in grants; \$209,842,000 in loans). I have been a firm supporter of Federal assistance for higher education facilities construction. But particularly in urban areas, where vacant land is not available, the expansion of college and university facilities often conflicts with other interests. My bill is intended to soften a side-effect of university expansion—the dislocation of families and businesses in the surrounding community. Institutional expansion in a city causes great personal hardship and expense to individual residents of the community, who are displaced from their homes. This is compounded when there is no relocation assistance.