

in 1900 by Booker T. Washington, and we continue in the tradition of the founders to attempt to espouse better management techniques and to encourage entrepreneurship among Negroes.

We are presently in 52 cities and we have a funded project, funded recently by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Economic Development Administration to further this objective of ours within 13 project cities.

First of all, I might say that the National Business League is always pleased to be afforded the opportunity to present its views on pending legislation prior to the enactment of the laws. All too often we are confronted with the "Fait Accompli," and must react to statutes already adopted very frequently to limited avail.

So today we have an opportunity to comment on pending legislation prior to its enactment, and that very opportunity dramatizes most succinctly, our poverty, our deprivation and the disadvantage of our position relative to our white contemporaries. The National Business League is a dedicated organization composed largely of poor business people and we do not have the resources to clinically dissect the kind of sophisticated legislation proposed here today. That is a job for sharp young lawyers whose services we need but for which we cannot pay.

So our remarks here today must be viewed in the context of our ability as a voluntary, poor, business oriented organization, not as the expert legal testimony of exceptional lawyers.

Looking at the bill as a whole, it seems to be trying to set some broad general standards of equitable acquisition and reuse of property by Federal agencies.

To the extent that these enactments will achieve that goal, the NBL is constrained to applaud its purposes, and to hope that its principal objectives will be achieved. Such a uniform standard of action in this area is long overdue and if passed one can only hope that its intent and purpose will not be frustrated by "administrative repeal" or strangling execution regulations.

The bill's present text repeatedly refers to "the administrator" but no place that we could find states what administrator will have the powers set forth, nor does it clearly indicate what agency of Government would have jurisdiction over the bill's end product.

Too, it is not clear to us just how far this bill intends to go in making mandatory upon the State or local agencies the general provisions of the legislation. Where a State administers the performance of Federal legislation. There is too ample a degree of room for State repeal of Federal intent where the Federal intent and thrust is not more clearly stated. Moreover, there should be some penalty attached for noncompliance by a State in any area of the legislation's action phases.

On page 33 of the proposed bill, section 801 of title VIII declares it to be public policy that persons to be relocated because of Federal action or federally assisted action shall be justly and equitably treated.

But nowhere in this or subsequent sections do we find any detailed enforcement teeth in such a policy. Earlier in title V, the bill's introduction mentions "Federally Assisted" and "Federally Aided" programs. Now, it may be that somewhere in the bill there is written some kind of enforcement guidelines or techniques that would assure equitable enforcement of the provision of the bill, whether the action taker