

Secondly, to what extent can you generalize each of them and the objectives of these criteria? Man has not yet measured up to that kind of situation. I do not know if he is going to. I would welcome anything you have to offer in accordance with Senator Baker's suggestion.

In your statement you have indicated support for the \$5,000 supplemental payment on the taking of a home over and above its fair market value. Is it really necessary to put a \$5,000 ceiling on it?

MR. BRIDWELL. May I respond in the context of my personal opinion? Senator MUSKIE. Yes.

MR. BRIDWELL. No; \$5,000 has not the slightest thing to do with it. The key to it is how you define "decent, safe, and sanitary."

Senator MUSKIE. Would you give any guess as to how much you would add to the cost if you eliminate the ceiling?

MR. BRIDWELL. Well, as long as you tie the two things together, you do not add anything, because I believe the words used here are "decent, safe, and sanitary" by modest standards, or something to that effect. The cost goes up or it goes down or it is some place in the middle according to the criteria of what constitutes "decent, safe, and sanitary."

If, for example, you use the definition as used in the 1960 census, then there are not going to be very many cases in which you even use the \$5,000. If, on the other hand, you define "decent, safe, and sanitary" in the sense of a dwelling that each individual in the family must have a decent bedroom and a decent bath, then it is perfectly obvious that the cost is going to go sky high. Those are the ridiculous extremes. So the \$5,000 per se is not really a meaningful criterion. The critical element in the phraseology is decent, safe, and sanitary by modest standards.

Senator MUSKIE. The \$5,000 figure strikes me as representing an excess of caution by administrators who are concerned about open ended commitments. But I can understand this origin. I do not criticize it. It really strikes me that it is kind of a hard and arbitrary line you can draw between justice for one group and injustice for another.

MR. BRIDWELL. I think it goes back to the same problem that is a philosophical problem, Senator, that we have either discussed directly or worked around the edges of. It is this problem that in our society, we require or it has been our practice certainly to require very specific kinds of law, administratively established criteria, and procedures. Then somebody else comes along and says, "Ok, now, this is what you said you were going to do and how you were going to do it." Then they check very carefully to make sure that you did it that way.

Senator MUSKIE. One of the reasons you do it that way is so that Congress can have something to raise hell about with the Department.

I have one more question the staff has prepared. I think, rather than take the time to read it, since it is a two-page question, I will submit it to you.

It asks, for example, after the rhetoric, for all the rules, regulations, and other instructions related to relocation programs in the Federal-aid highway program, including bringing up to date the data on State programs contained in the recent highway report; secondly, provide separate information with respect to all negotiations and other matters pertaining to land acquisition and so on, and the value of acquisition; and thirdly, provide us with samples of specific cases involving