

large enough to encourage units to make comprehensive plans and programs based on assurance of availability of the Federal Government's financing commitment.

The fund would involve programs crossing present departmental lines. The application would be multipurpose and comprehensive in nature and would be very similar to a city's budget request document. Communities would have the option to use but would never be required, to make use of the funds so provided in lieu of existing categorical programs.

This is not really a block grant or revenue sharing. It would leave undisturbed the processing system for technical compliance. It could include a much greater role for State government. It would assure the maximum benefits from fiscal planning, construction, timing, program scale, and program management. It would, moreover, and perhaps most importantly, give maximum consideration to the diversity of local needs and local innovation, priorities, control, and flexibility.

Now, I would like to speak of title VIII, uniform relocation assistance.

In any discussion of relocation of displaced persons, we must start from the premise that it costs no more or no less to move a family or a business because the family or business was displaced by an urban renewal project rather than an interstate highway or local code enforcement program or any other kind of project. Yet the amount of financial and nonfinancial assistance available from the Federal Government to assist families or businesses to relocate in the face of a federally supported project varies astonishingly from program to program.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its 1965 report, "Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by Governments," stated:

Thousands of people and businesses are forced to move every year because of governmental acquisition of property or enforcement of housing and building codes. All indications are that this place of displacement will accelerate with increased urbanization and the consequent mounting demands for urban services and growth of federal, state, and local programs for the renewal of cities. It has been estimated, for example, that from 1964 to 1972 the federally aided urban renewal and highway programs alone will have caused dislocation of a total of 825,000 families and individuals and 136,000 business and nonprofit organizations.

As the magnitude of displacement has increased in recent years, there has been growing concern over the impact on those forced to move—concern over whether these "displacees" are having to bear a disproportionate share of the cost of the benefit created by the public works program necessitating their move. The concern is voiced particularly regarding the poor and the elderly, and marginal and submarginal small businesses; these individuals and businesses seem most often to be in the way of property-taking programs and are least capable of coping with the adjustments of a forced move.

In 1968, Nashville expects to relocate 900 families and 200 businesses, many of them small marginal operations. In the next 10 years, we foresee displacing as many as 3,505 families. Most of this displacement will occur from federally aided projects such as Interstate 40 and urban renewal. To our city as well as all the others facing similar tasks; it is imperative that relocation policy and assistance be made uniform at all levels of government. We feel that title VIII of S. 698 is an important building block in the achievement of this goal.