

It must be remembered that we are dealing with individual human needs. It seems so simple looking at a plan to say that if a house or a small store is in the way, move it or destroy it. But what is so often overlooked or at least given insufficient attention is the fact that when a person or a businessman is displaced and relocated elsewhere, there is a tremendous social cost paid often unmeasurable in dollars and cents, not just by the individual but also his neighbors and his community.

Relocation policies must focus on and consolidate response to individual needs and to the social needs of the total community. Relocation policies affecting businesses must be flexible enough to respond to the complexities of the economic area. Sometimes in relocation, the operation is a success but the patient dies. In sum, our relocation policies must be such as to enable us to say to the displaced citizen that you, too, will gain and benefit from the public improvement which forces your location and I am obviously referring here to a gain or benefit not simply limited to what a highway or public building will provide, for this indeed to him might be slight.

There are a few other points I want to make.

First, we feel it highly important that all relocation, for no matter what project, be carried out by one city agency which has at its command the tools and resources to do a thorough job. Where cities have established effective agencies to undertake relocation, the Federal Government should contract with that agency for this purpose.

Second, we want to emphasize the need in the development and unification of policy, for postrelocation followup. The first 6 months are critical to a person or business newly relocated. Families and businesses are confronted by a whole new set of problems in their new location. Relocation responsibility therefore does not stop once a family is in a new home. They must also be given every assistance in adjusting to their new environment.

In conclusion, it is particularly fitting that this bill now attempts to bring uniformity but more importantly a higher degree of equality to the troubled relocation issue. We can no more eloquently state the importance of this provision than to quote the Senate Committee on Government Operations reporting on S. 1681, the Uniform Relocation Act of 1966. The Committee said:

This policy is necessary to eliminate the great inconsistencies that exist among federal and federally assisted programs with respect to the amount and scope of such payments, and the advisory assistance and assurance of housing offered. It recognizes that relocation is a serious and growing problem in the United States and that the pace of displacement will accelerate in the years immediately ahead. It recognizes that advisory assistance is of growing importance in the relocation process especially for the poor, the nonwhites, the elderly, and small business people. It recognizes the need for more equitable land acquisition practices in connection with the procurement of real property by eminent domain. In short, this legislation recognizes that the Federal Government has a primary responsibility to provide uniform treatment of those forced to relocate by federal and federally aided public improvement programs and to ease the impact of such forced moves.

Title IX. The confusion, delay, uncertainty and misunderstanding which exists today in the field of acquisition of real property by governmental entities for public use is notorious. On the basis alone that there is no justification for differences between the taking of one man's property as opposed to another, we fully endorse the pro-