

In this particular group of aids, the agencies concerned have worked out arrangements which are designed to minimize administrative confusion. But during our recent subcommittee hearings, it became evident that confusion continues to characterize the administration of these programs. The simple form 101, by which local officials attempt to present their case for Federal aid, cannot be filled out until the local official has carefully read—and understood—four pages of closely typed instructions. Judging from a number of examples of cases of grant applications from which local officials have had no response—for sometimes as long as 2 years—I think it can safely be said that improvements in their administration are imperative. This may require action beyond voluntary cooperation among the agencies involved.

Title VI of my proposed bill would give the President the authority he needs to consolidate these programs—subject to congressional review—if he determines such action would improve their administration.

Mr. President, this proposed title has been suggested by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It has been studied carefully by the Commission's experts, and I believe it merits the Senate's serious consideration. I believe the Congress itself provided a precedent for such a consolidation of programs when it enacted the Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Service Amendments of 1966. I hope this proposal will be seriously considered as a means to more effective management of these important grant programs.

UNIFORM RELOCATION

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today contains two other important titles. The first of these—title VIII—is concerned with a program of uniform relocation assistance for those forced to relocate as a result of the acquisition of real property for Federal and federally aided public improvement programs.

Title VIII is not a new measure in this body. I introduced it as S. 1681 in the 89th Congress. It was passed unanimously by the Senate in July 1966 and subsequently was referred to the House Committee on Public Works, where no action was taken.

Very briefly, this title would provide a policy of uniform treatment for the thousands of individuals who are affected every year by such Government projects as urban renewal and highways.

Mr. President, relocation is a serious and growing problem in the United States. Federal and federally aided programs are displacing approximately 111,000 families and individuals, 18,000 businesses and nonprofit organizations, and 4,000 farm operators each year. The pace of Federal programs indicates this trend will continue. Federally assisted programs alone—mostly urban renewal and highway programs—displace about 96 percent of the families and individuals, 96 percent of the businesses, and 34 percent of the farms affected by land acquisition.

The uniform relocation bill passed by the Senate in the last Congress was the result of an intensive study conducted by the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the Public Works Committee and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in cooperation with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, as well as by our own Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

These studies revealed serious inconsistencies among Federal and federally assisted programs with respect to the amount and scope of relocation payments and advisory assistance. For instance, a homeowner whose property is taken for a federally aided urban renewal project is entitled to moving costs up to \$200. His neighbor, whose property is taken for a federally aided highway program, is also entitled to \$200 but only if the State has authorized participation in the Federal relocation program. Inconsistency in payments for business moving expenses is even greater. Here, the Federal-Aid Highway Act allows such displacement by a federally aided urban renewal project entitles the businessman up to \$25,000 for moving costs. Finally, urban renewal provides fairly comprehensive advice and counseling to business and individuals; the Federal highway program provides no such service.

Among other findings in the studies to which I referred is the fact that the single greatest problem in relocating families and individuals is the shortage of standard housing for low-income groups. Small businesses—particularly those owned and operated by the elderly, such as "Mom and Pop" grocery stores—are major casualties. They have less capital, find it more difficult to secure outside financing, and need assistance to supplement their energy or spirit to resume business in a new location.