

Senator MUSKIE. The Budget Bureau recommended that the bill be amended to provide that relocation payments should be shared in accordance with the project formula. I do not know whether I should invite you to take issue with the Bureau of the Budget or not. I am going to create the opportunity.

I think it is a very difficult problem that the Bureau presents here, especially after the testimony of last week. I am very fearful that if we wait for the States to react to that kind of provision in the legislation, there simply will be no relocation programs in the States. How do you react?

Secretary WEAVER. I think I would have to look at this in two ways:

First, rather parochially, for those programs for which I have responsibility where we now have relocation payments, which are the most liberal of those in any other programs in the Federal Government, and where payments are now made 100 percent out of Federal funds—I am told that this was done at the beginning because of constitutional and legal considerations, because it was felt at that time that there might be some impediments of an institutional nature for some of the States to make adequate contributions to these payments. I would certainly feel that unless I were satisfied, and I am not now satisfied, that within this period of transition there were an assurance that payments through this new formula would be made equal to what they now are I would be opposed to the new formula as a person and I would certainly so indicate if I were asked by the Bureau of the Budget. I speak now as an individual, but I think this problem is so pressing and so important that the danger of cutting payments off or of reducing them in this particular period would be tragic. And I could not in good conscience propose that.

Now, we have another problem. That is with the new programs and here, I think you have a different situation. It would probably be appropriate to experiment with the new and see what could be done in this period, because you are not taking anything away; you are giving more anyhow. If it were successful there, then you could adapt our programs to the success in the new approach.

Senator MUSKIE. Well, my reaction to that would be that especially in the highway field, you simply do not have too many States with a favorable power structure, if that is the way to describe it, in those programs. In my State, the highway program is run and served by people who are interested in drawing straight lines with their roads. Of course, in a State like Maine, you can do that with minimum risk of displacing people.

I recall one such straight line that went through a cemetery. Well, that displaced a few people, but I guess they did not care.

But I found no sympathy at all in the highway program with these kinds of problems when I was Governor. Not that they are insensitive to people or not human like anyone else, but this is simply an area to which they have not been exposed, about which they have not been concerned, and with which they have not dealt programwise. The highway programs are creating many of these problems. To expect them to respond is a little unrealistic, especially when you take into account the fact that highways are pretty much built by earmarked funds and those funds are protected jealously by the constituents in these State capitals. To suggest diverting those funds to these social