

I know in Philadelphia we have taken a step toward—that is, we have added to our central relocation office a special housing supply unit that works with private builders to encourage them to come up with housing where the dislocation needs are greatest.

We would also like to specifically comment on three other provisions in title VIII. In section 802(c) (3), we believe that the \$300 payment for a potential purchaser is not adequate, and frankly, we would like to see a payment to supplement the downpayment of a homeowner so that he can purchase a home within 20 percent of his income. We believe that unless you do it that way, you are only giving partial help and do not solve the problem.

We would like to suggest in terms of 802(e) that we eliminate the relocation adjustment payment. We have submitted, as part of our statement for the record, an article that appeared in our journal that shows how inefficient and really ineffective that payment has been. We have already received this morning confirming opinions from the people who are working with the RAP, Relocation Adjustment Payment, to show that it does not work. Instead, we would suggest that there be a flat payment for all displaced persons to help tide them over some of the adjustments they have to make. But more importantly, we should enlarge the leasing program known as section 23 in the Public Housing Provisions, so that people who are renters will be able to afford housing within their income. We think a liberalization of the section 23 leasing program, to apply for all dislocated people would be far better than the relocation adjustment payment as now constituted.

In this regard we have noted that there has been a holdback in some communities on the leasing programs; namely, because a lease for a maximum period of 5 years (with an option for another five) is not always sufficient to encourage private landlords to rehabilitate their property; the amortization or extensive rehabilitation requires sometimes more than 10 years.

We, therefore, would like to see the initial lease period go to 10 years, with an option for another 10 years.

Finally, in terms of title IX, here again we strongly endorse the uniform land acquisition policy which is contained in title IX. I note with a great deal of interest and support these key provisions taking into account, in terms of the value payment, the impact of public activities where it results in the decrease and value of the property. This happens to be one of the provisions, by the way, in the Pennsylvania eminent domain law that some of us were responsible for.

We also welcome something that we are unable to do in Philadelphia because of the real estate laws of our State; namely, compensation for tenants when they make improvements in the property, which is included in title IX of the bill. We think that that is long overdue, because we know of many hardships where improvements have been made by tenants, and under the lease by the landlord they are not able to collect any compensation for that improvement.

We would also like to point out that many of our communities have adopted a policy which we have asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to adopt nationwide.

Where we are dealing with the homeowner or the small businessman to whom a real estate transaction may be a once in a lifetime thing,