

(The complete prepared statement of Senator Tydings, above-referred to, follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for enabling me to come here today to testify in support of my amendment to Title VIII of the Intergovernmental Cooperation bill. I know you have had several days of hearings on the bill as a whole, and have heard from a widely representative group of interested witnesses. I hope this means that many more people are aware of the need for this legislation than has been true in the past.

Before getting down to the case for my amendment, I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the subcommittee for the extensive work you have been doing for several years to illuminate the need for inter-governmental cooperation and to hammer out sound remedies for problems which are extremely complex and difficult to resolve. This is fairly esoteric work—the general public has never been very aware that problems grow like weeds between the various levels and compartments of government in this country. This is not an area of reform that is easily explained. But the effort and intelligence expended on this legislation should be widely recognized. The country is greatly in your debt.

Title VIII of this bill would establish uniform relocation payments and advisory assistance for those who are displaced from homes or businesses by Federally-sponsored programs. We are talking primarily of urban renewal and highway construction programs.

The need for such relocation assistance has been fully documented by this subcommittee, by the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Furthermore, the unanimous vote for this bill in the Senate last year indicates that the extensive studies made by each of these groups have borne fruit.

My amendment to Title VIII is designed to cover a specific kind of hardship which, in my view, would not be properly remedied by the bill as it stands.

My amendment would authorize payment according to a set formula to the owner of a displaced private business which cannot be relocated without a substantial loss of its patronage. In order to be eligible, the owner must be fifty years of age or older and a tenant of the property from which the business was displaced. His earnings over a three year period have to have averaged less than \$10,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, as you pointed out last year during Senate consideration of this bill, "small businesses—particularly those owned and operated by the elderly, such as Mom and Pop grocery stores—are major casualties" of land acquisition and clearance for urban renewal or highway construction. The price of progress in urban renewal is too often destruction of the livelihood and earning capacity of the small, neighborhood storekeeper.

In Baltimore, for example, I know of a corner candy store owner who lived and worked in the same location for 40 years. His store was a focus of activity where neighbors stopped to buy their newspapers, to chat and to buy last minute groceries. For 40 years he was part and parcel of that community. I lived in the neighborhood when I was a law student at the University of Maryland, and I was a frequent visitor in that little candy store.

Several years passed and then the city of Baltimore embarked upon an urban renewal project in the area. The candy store and all of its customers were told they had to move. The owner of the building, from whom this man had rented for 40 years, received payment for his building. But the proprietor of the candy store received no payment at all. His store was gone, his clientele was gone, his goodwill was a thing of the past. He was set adrift at 65 years of age with no place to live, no source of income, and only token relocation assistance. This was clearly an extreme hardship.

To be sure, some hardships are inevitable if we are to redevelop slum neighborhoods and renew economic life in the cities. I do not think we should allow a measure of inconvenience to block progress. I support urban renewal. But I firmly believe that we owe a moral obligation to the families and small businesses that have to be relocated to minimize their sacrifices and to make them as whole as possible.

Title VIII as written would provide 100% Federal reimbursement for business moving expenses up to \$25,000 and provides for federal sharing for costs