

* * * Similarly, small businessmen—especially those in leased premises—often incur economic loss and hardship as a result of displacement by urban renewal or public housing which is not offset by current compensation practices and moving expense reimbursements.²

Government has not been oblivious to the relocation problem, as the President's statement indicates. At all levels—Federal, State, and local—it has responded to some degree by providing relocation payments and other assistance to displacees. But these provisions are inconsistent—among programs of the same level of government and among the different levels. Also, serious questions have been raised about the equity and adequacy of many of them. One consequence sometimes has been to slow down necessary governmental programs that require the taking of property. Relocation has been called, for example, the "Achilles heel" of urban renewal.

The relocation problem has many intergovernmental implications. The two major programs causing displacement are the federally aided urban renewal and highway programs—the first carried out by local governments, and the second by State governments but to a considerable extent within urban areas. Urban areas are the focus of most of the displacement problem, and the inconsistencies and inadequacies in relocation provisions are aggravated by the fact that many different displacing programs of different levels of government operate side by side within the same community.

In addition, efforts to organize effective and humane programs of relocation are hampered by poor coordination between the different communities of metropolitan areas. The housing market within which displaced people must look for other quarters typically extends across local boundaries to encompass the larger metropolitan area. Similarly, businesses that need commercial or industrial space for relocation may best satisfy their needs in some other part of the metropolitan area. Unless the different local governments of any area cooperate in planning for relocation, the choices available to displaced people and businesses may be unduly limited and the hardships of relocation compounded.

Broader issues of intergovernmental relations are involved in relocation questions. The pattern of local government and finance in metropolitan areas often encourages local efforts to exclude low-cost housing and thus to limit the freedom of movement of many people who are forced by government action to leave the places where they have been living. Social and economic disparities noted earlier tend to sharpen conflicts between local communities in metropolitan areas in ways that interfere with relocation efforts. Further, the limitations of a purely local perspective can be as unfortunate for relocation as for water supply and sewage disposal. Just as provincial water and sewage policies impose significant burdens on neighboring communities, so policies of excluding low-cost housing create hardships for people and governments elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

Relocation, like water supply, is widely acknowledged as a major governmental concern in metropolitan areas. As such, it puts the governmental arrangements in these areas to a further test. Again, inadequacies in intergovernmental relations emerge as major obstacles to more effective performance. An examination of these weaknesses

² *Congressional Record*, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964, vol. 110, No. 13, p. 1047.