ment has found that the local land use planning requirements of the Public Sale Act of 1964 have produced salutary changes in Interior's land disposition program and afforded the Department major opportunities to strengthen intergovernmental relations in this functional area—an opportunity, it would seem, that the Department and the States and counties involved are using to good advantage.

Title VIII: This title establishes a uniform policy for the fair and equitable relocation of persons and businesses forced to move by Federal or federally assisted programs. With the exception of those provisions relating to land acquisition which are now covered by Title IX, Title VIII in this bill is identical to a separate bill which passed the Senate on July 22, 1966, but died in House committee.

The Advisory Commission considered the issue of Federal relocation policy in a report, approved in January 1965, on relocation: Unequal treatment of people and businesses displaced by governments. This report resulted in the subsequent introduction by you, Mr. Chairman, of S. 1681.

As already noted, the Commission's 1965 study found that the most serious inequities in Federal relocation policies arose because highway programs cause about one-third of the relocation problem and the level of highway assistance and payments is substantially below that of the major Federal displacing program—urban renewal. It is therefore significant that a special 1967 study on highway relocation assistance undertaken by the Department of Transportation pursuant to congressional mandate in Public Law 89–574 strongly corroborates the principal findings of the ACIR study.

Summing up the Commission's recommendations, they are precisely in accord with those in title VIII with respect to (a) uniformity among Federal and federally assisted programs concerning relocation payments and advisory assistance, (b) assurance of provision of a supply of standard housing for those displaced, (c) Federal reimbursement for relocation expenses in federally aided programs, and (d) Federal encouragement of coordination of relocation administration in major urban areas.

A relevant question is: What would be the cost to the Federal Government of the proposed provisions for relocation payments compared to the cost of present provisions? It is our very rough estimate that the cost to the Federal Government for fiscal year 1967 under title VIII of S. 698 would have been about $79 million, compared to an estimated $40 million cost under the relocation payments provisions existing at that time. Of the total increase of about $39 million, about $29 million is attributable to the highway program, resulting from extension of coverage from 33 (in fiscal year 1967) to 50 States, liberalization of relocation payments, and the proposed increase in the Federal share of relocation payments from 90 percent of interstate roads and 50 percent on primary and secondary roads up to 100 percent for all payments of $25,000 or less. Another $8 million of the total increase would be for the HUD programs, again reflecting liberalization of relocation payments provisions. The remainder of the estimated increase is accounted for by liberalized payments by the Army Corps of Engineers, and initiation of payments by four Federal agencies not now reimbursing for relocation expenses: GSA, the International Boundary and Water Commission, the Post Office Department, and TVA.