

Secretary WEAVER. What we have attempted to do in our own programs with any activity that we have is to make certain compensations. I had the very difficult problem some years ago of what we call the Ma and Pa business; you know, the old couple, may be the candy store. Maybe they only make a couple of thousand dollars a year, maybe they do not make that much. But they cannot pay \$5 more rent and they cannot be relocated; they are indigenous to that neighborhood. It presents a tremendous problem, because how do you evaluate what they are worth? They are not worth anything any place else; they are not worth too much where they are. What we did was try to steal something from the labor movement with a dismissal wage, you know, and we had a sort of dismissal cash payment to them. It was from that that evolved this \$5,000 we are talking about for people who are displaced with homeownership.

I think that it is that type of thing that we have to develop, each situation requiring a different type of tool to minimize injustice because there is the other side of the picture. That is that you just cannot look at this as an inexhaustible fund which can just be spent without any regard to the economic factors in it. While you have to be concerned with the human, you also have to have some type of administratively feasible approach. This is what we did in that particular instance.

Senator MUSKIE. May I ask this?

Are those cases of actual physical displacement or do they fall in the category which Senator Hansen suggested?

Secretary WEAVER. No, these are people who are put out of business because of urban renewal or because of HUD housing.

Senator MUSKIE. Their property is actually physically taken?

Secretary WEAVER. Well, the property usually is not their's, but the property which they lease or rent is actually physically taken. It is not bypassed.

When you get to the problem of bypass, I must say I thought my problems were difficult enough, but I find this one is even more difficult than anything I have dealt with. It has been impossible, even dealing with these I have been familiar with, to give answers off the top of my head. I certainly do not know the answer to this one.

Senator MUSKIE. Have you had a situation in urban renewal projects like the one cutting off the business from the highway; that business is not taken, not subject, not eligible, but located near the slum housing and the substandard residential areas which are taken. What do you do with that kind of thing?

Secretary WEAVER. The classic example of that is a store, let us say in New York City, which I know fairly well, which specializes in Puerto Rican foods and specializes, particularly in a market that is practically a 100 percent Puerto Rican market. You have an area there torn out by an improvement and the Puerto Rican population is materially reduced. That store has a problem and there are no provisions that I know anywhere in any law that meets that problem. I suppose the answer to that is that there is a point where anybody who is in business has to take certain risks and they are risks of changes which come. The question is first in dealing with those risks that are definitely and directly indentifiable before you get to the fringe ones.