

On page 50, I would reword lines 17 through 23 by eliminating the phrase, "if consistent with project requirements." I would add a provision requiring absolute assurance of rehousing before displacement. I would include the same protection in lines 22 through 24 on page 56.

2. The bill contains a number of suggestions on assisting homeowners, tenants, and owners of small business in getting out of the areas that are to be used for various kinds of improvement. As I have said before, in some instances "should" is used. It is my opinion that the word "shall" is necessary. For example, line 8 on page 50 and lines 5 and 9 on pages 52 seem inadequate for protection of some persons.

Also, I think that we need to give more attention to the possibility of allowing owners to stay in some areas that are being improved. For example, the construction of an underpass and the widening of the 100 block of Massachusetts Avenue, Northwest, in Washington have caused a considerable amount of demolition that has adversely affected the businesses in the area.

In one case, the owner of a drugstore has been in the community for many years. His property is obviously valuable. It would seem that every consideration should be given to making it financially attractive for this kind of businessman to stay and benefit from whatever improvement there is in the area.

I might say that my knowledge of the potential value of that property comes from the fact that our office for many years was located at 100 Massachusetts Avenue, and at the time we first became tenants we could have purchased it for \$14,000, but we do not like to own property as an organization and did not purchase it. Subsequently, it was sold to someone on the death of some of the owners for \$30,000, and it is my understanding that the last sale of the property amounted to something in excess of \$70,000.

Now, it seems to me that somebody must realize that is going to be a very valuable spot. The drugstore to which I refer is in that same general area, and it seems to me something ought to be done to see that a businessman like that can stay in the area if he wants to stay there. Fortunately, he is still holding out. I do not know how long he will do it, but in any event, I think we should not leave it to chance. I think legislation ought to guarantee it.

A filling station operator in the area finally gave up his business because the roadway construction severely reduced the volume of his trade. In that case a little assistance might well have permitted him to hold on until the work was completed. At that time the location will be excellent.

When this construction started, it was difficult for people to get into his station and he tried to hold out as long as he could, but eventually he had to give up and somebody else took it over.

On the whole, S. 698 contains safeguards that would correct the worst kinds of abuses that now afflict those who are displaced by various public projects or Government assisted private programs. However, there are some serious problems which are not covered by the relocation provisions of title VIII. For example, the proviso beginning on line 22, page 36, does not seem to help the homeowner who will not get enough money from the sale of his dwelling to permit him to buy in a different area.