

special purpose units of local government cause dislocation. Thus, it covers all public agencies which use Federal funds for projects where relocation is necessary.

However, the bill apparently does not apply to nonprofit organizations receiving Federal assistance. Yet, private colleges, universities, hospitals, and nonprofit organizations constructing neighborhood facilities, sometimes displace persons in connection with projects which are federally aided. Perhaps such projects, too, should be encompassed by the act.

The second important feature of the bill is the uniformity which it requires. Relocation payments and other assistance must be the same for each type of Federal project and federally assisted program. Although I am not a technical expert on the details of relocation payments, the requirements of the bill seem to me to be generally appropriate. It would be better to err on the generous side than to be too stingy with those who must make a personal sacrifice by moving to promote the general public welfare.

The provisions for relocation assistance other than monetary benefits are also important. The poor in particular need assistance in locating adequate housing at rents they can afford, and small businessmen need help in finding other quarters and in contacting institutions which make small business loans.

Relocation assistance should be a process which starts early in any project. If unemployed family heads can enter manpower training programs six months or a year before they are to be displaced, by the time moving day arrives they can be in steady jobs with higher wages, and thus be able to have more income which will give them a wider range of housing choices. Early health examinations followed by any needed medical services might be able to remedy many health problems before the move. A small businessman might benefit from management assistance before he has to relocate, and this would improve his chances for succeeding in a new location. In a similar manner, other opportunities might be made available to persons prior to relocation.

The bill should make clear that full and meaningful relocation assistance beyond financial payments is not merely desirable but is a mandatory requirement. Perhaps the bill could be strengthened by prohibiting acquisition and clearance of property unless there is a suitable program of relocation assistance and an adequate supply of the right kind of housing and places for small businesses.

As to financing relocation programs, I believe that it is appropriate for the Federal government to pay the entire cost up to \$25,000 for any one person, as the bill provides. This allows uniform payments to start immediately without waiting for state enabling legislation. The ceiling permits the rare situation of unusually high relocation costs of a business to be handled by sharing costs between the Federal government and the State or local agency on the same basis as other costs of the program, such as 90-10 percent in the case of interstate highways and two-thirds/one-third for urban renewal.

I would urge that this bill be passed as soon as possible with its provisions to take effect upon enactment. The next several years will be crucial as the activities of the Federal highway program are stepped up in cities and as urban renewal expands in conjunction with the model cities program. Delay would continue to make the poor and moderate-income families and small businessmen bear an inordinate share of the inconveniences of the programs which will make American cities better places to live and work.

STATEMENT BY HON. STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

MORE EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR LANDOWNERS DISPLACED BY PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Chairman, Thank you for this opportunity to comment in support of the amendment we have offered to title VIII of your bill, S. 698, designed to achieve a uniform policy for "fair and equitable treatment of owners, tenants, and other persons displaced by the acquisition of real property for Federal and federally assisted programs."

These programs are justified by expected benefits for the general public. The purpose of our proposal is to ease the unfair financial burden often placed upon those who are forced to sell their property to the Government for such programs, when, because of circumstances beyond their control, the owners are not able to find reasonable replacement property that would entitle them to obtain capital gains tax deferral.