

of his property would not be substantially different whether he provides a service to the public or handles only his own produce. It would appear the treatment provided should be comparable.

We understand that a farmer who discontinues a farm operation as the result of the taking is eligible for a relocation allowance under section 802(d) if the remainder property is no longer an economic unit; and that if his dwelling is taken he is also eligible for a relocation allowance under section 802(c). If this is not clear we would suggest that the matter be clarified by the legislative history.

We should note in this connection that a farmer who is forced to discontinue a farm operation is frequently faced with substantial but difficult to determine costs. He may have to sell his machinery and equipment at a loss because they are not adaptable to the farm he has acquired, or because he has not been able to locate another farm suitable for his purposes and his finances. His new farm may be located at a considerable distance from the farm from which he is dispossessed, thus necessitating the development of new marketing outlets. He may have to sell his stocks or grain, or breeding or feeding livestock at "forced sale." His operations for a year may be disrupted because he is unable to acquire a farm prior to planting time.

In some cases he may lose a crop or not plant one on the farm from which he is being dispossessed, because negotiations are underway and the time of settlement uncertain. Since average prices of farmland have been increasing 6 to 8 percent in each of recent years, if the farmer is unable to locate a replacement farm promptly, the amount received for compensation may be inadequate to purchase a comparable farm.

These costs are separate and distinct from those involved in moving from one dwelling to another.

We understand that an elderly or handicapped farmer who decided not to continue farming when his farm is taken would be eligible for the allowance provided by section 802(e).

ON UNIFORM LAND ACQUISITION POLICY

We strongly endorse the provisions of title IX relating to land acquisition procedures.

Few activities of Federal agencies have created more ill-feeling among farmers than the land acquisition practices of some agencies.

The factual situation reported by the House Committee on Public Works "Study of Compensation and Assistance for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition in Federal and Federally Assisted Programs," Committee Print No. 31, 88th Congress, reflects an amazing and, in our view, intolerable situation.

The committee report indicates that in 34,422 purchases by Defense Department agencies, the agency's initial offering was less than the agency-approved appraisal in 24,877 cases, and property was actually purchased for less than the approved appraisal value in 7,897 cases.

The report further indicates that, in 10,296 purchases by Interior Department agencies, less than the appraised value was offered in 864 cases and less than the appraised value was paid in 653 cases.

It appears to us that title IX has been drafted very carefully, and if enacted will accomplish the desired purposes as set forth in section 901(a).