

I would like testimony on the benefits of this proposal. What are the merits, the savings, the advantages to coordination and flexibility for State and local governments of this title?

Is this a realistic way of reducing over 500 authorizations and appropriations? Title VI is a step forward, but additional steps may be needed.

On title VII, I have a basic question. Will the language assure that future land transactions by the GSA will support, rather than frustrate, the efforts of local communities in their land planning and use programs?

Title VIII is, in my opinion, one of the most important titles in the bill. Although figures tend to be speculative, particularly in view of reduced Federal spending, we may expect the dislocation of over a million families and individuals, 180,000 businesses, and 40,000 farm operators over the next 10 years as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs.

Much of this will concern the poor and the elderly—white and black—where the impact hits with greatest force.

Are the measures we have provided adequate to assist and compensate these people and businesses in the light of what we now know about the personal and economic impact of dislocation today?

For those whose property is taken to make way for public improvement, is the fair market value standard of compensation enough to enable people to take up their lives in a similar or improved manner elsewhere?

What can be done to provide for relocation assistance at an earlier stage than is presently provided—for assistance at the stage when the planning and surveying of the proposed project is announced, and people panic? What can be done to relieve them of the fear of removal and smooth the road to orderly relocation?

With respect to title IX, have we succeeded in providing ground rules sufficient to insure that the Federal Government and State and local governments using Federal funds will deal fairly, whether by negotiation or condemnation, in taking land for public improvement?

In closing, I want to say that I am optimistic about this bill. The House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the first five titles in 1966, and is continuing with its consideration this year. The mood may be changing toward the concept of meaningful compensation and assistance for acquisition and relocation under Federal and federally assisted programs.

It always takes years for good ideas to surface, and eventually become law. We are hopeful that the administration today will set the stage for a much stronger support for the measures contained in S. 698 than it has in the past.

Last year we passed the first really significant step forward in intergovernmental relations legislation in years—the intergovernmental personnel bill. That bill is moving forward in the House, and would provide funds and assistance for the development of State and local personnel systems, training programs, fellowships, and exchange of personnel. The support among State and local administrators for this legislation was tremendous.

Now we are down to the next big step this year: The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act.