

Mr. AKERSON. Right. This is an extremely far-reaching part of the bill, but I find that many people are not aware of it. I have been in the position of being the final judge and authority on some of these relocation payments, and it is not as pleasant a position as some people might think. I would welcome the avenue of going into district court.

Senator BAKER. One further question, if I may.

On page 2 of your statement, Mr. Libby, you make the proposal that the unlimited costs of moving "should be financed 90 percent by Federal funds and 10 percent by State funds."

This is as in interstate highway cases.

The proposal in the bill before the committee provides for the Federal Government to bear the first \$25,000 of these costs.

Do you take issue with that? Do you feel that the 90-10 formula is more appropriate for the entire cost?

Mr. LIBBY. Yes, sir. I say that that is just as much a cost of the highway as is concrete and steel. And I take issue with my friends in the Massachusetts government administration who sit back complacently and wait for Washington to pick up the whole tab. Sir, I think you are being overly generous and unnecessarily so. I think if you have got a 50-50 highway bill or a two-thirds-one-third highway bill I say, sir, it should go from the first dollar in that proportion.

Senator BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. AKERSON. I will have to give another point of view, because I am familiar with what the public agencies in Massachusetts are anticipating. I am familiar with what the legislators in Massachusetts are anticipating. My forecast would be that if legislation comes about that would require a contribution or a sharing of the first \$25,000, that this entire program will be delayed, slowed down. We will need new legislation. We have open-end legislation at the moment, which is simply waiting for Federal legislation.

I am sure the legislators and the State of Massachusetts are ready to share beyond \$25,000, but the general feeling is that the Federal Government has poured the cement in the \$25,000 grant for the first \$25,000, in what they have done with hundreds and hundreds of businesses, thousands I should say in the urban renewal program in Boston and in Cambridge, in Malden and in many other communities.

I think this would be a step backward. I think it would be reneging on the part of the Federal Government. I think it is impractical and unrealistic.

Senator BAKER. I thank you very much, Mr. Akerson, Mr. Goralnick and Mr. Libby.

May I say this in the interest of time? I would like to invite you to elaborate any of these thoughts with the staff with permission that any additional comments in this respect may be included in the record.

Thank you very much.

Mr. LIBBY. Thank you, sir.

(Mr. Akerson's complete statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY CHARLES B. AKERSON

At the request of Senator Edward W. Brooke, I offer the following testimony regarding the proposed Muskie bill S. 698.

I submit my opinions and comments as an individual and professional real estate counselor experienced in matters involving the relocation of business con-