Mr. QUIE. With respect to the public institutions where there is only State money involved, has there been provision made for relocation of the tenants? Have the public institutions used this condemnation right?

Mr. RYAN. Where the State university acquires land by purchase or condemnation, I understand there is provision for moving expenses. Both public and private institutions in New York may use the State dormitory authority law for the purpose of constructing dormitories and faculty housing. In that situation there are no relocation benefits available.

Mr. QUIE. That is all.

Mrs. GREEN. Congressman Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Just one question. Would you consider cost sharing since this is not all Federal money that is going into it?

Mr. RYAN. I have left open in my bill the question of how the relocation benefits are to be paid.

I would suggest that the Administrator could by regulation either include the cost of the relocation benefits in the loan or grant or require as a condition of a loan or grant that the institution itself put aside funds and give assurances that they would be spent for relocation benefits. A loan or grant could be conditioned on such assurances.

This is a question for counsel and the committee—how to effectuate this. The important point is that either as part of a loan or grant the cost of relocation be included or that, before the loan or grant is made, assurances be given by the institution that it has the funds from whatever source to make these payments and will make them.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Or on some kind of matching basis?

Mr. RYAN. Or on a matching basis. In other words, the issue I am raising is the plight of the displaced person who has no recourse, does not get assistance. And there is no legal requirement that he get assistance now.

Mr. GREEN. I know that you have not made any study of the cost of this but have any members of your staff made any study of what it would cost if this were done at Columbia University which I know is your primary concern at the moment?

Mr. RYAN. We looked at what the percentage was in terms of urban renewal. I don't think it would be as high in this case. In fiscal year 1967, relocation benefits amounted to about 8½ percent of the total urban renewal program in the country, a program of $370,600,000.

It is going to vary with the locality, what the cost of housing is in the locality and the availability of housing.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ryan. This will be taken up by the committee.

I think we are faced with the equity which you pose to the person who is renting and has his business destroyed and who suffers a great loss personally.

We are also faced with the dilemma that grows out of the fact that construction facility funds are cut from $450 to $75 million for next year and how we balance one against the other.

Mr. RYAN. I think there is this problem; but at the same time if we are going to finance construction and the result of that construction is severe hardship and inconvenience to individuals, we also have to take that into account.

In one way or another, as Congressman Hathaway suggested, there