

TESTIMONY OF PROF. GEORGE STERNLIEB, RESEARCH DIRECTOR,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, RUTGERS—THE STATE UNI-
VERSITY, NEWARK, N.J.

Mr. STERNLIEB. Thank you. Given the time pressures and many other things which I know you have got to do today, let me be as brief as possible.

I have already submitted a statement which summarizes my thinking and I would like to add to it a very few comments which are open to question.

First of all, I think we have to view relocation as a constant, not a temporary, occurrence, and certainly not a response to some phenomena that is going to go away. It is incumbent upon us to accept this fact, and I think this bill is a very important first step in the direction of developing appropriate methodology in governmental relationships which bring us ready for the 21st century.

We are going to have more relocation. We are going to have relocation not merely as a result of urban renewal and highway programs, we are going to have relocation, I think increasingly, because of technological shift, and right now we simply do not have the methodology appropriate to cope with this.

We have had some experience, some which I know you are familiar with. For example, an Armour meatpacking facility closed down. The company was willing to move some of its workers. There simply was no adequate governmental aid in terms of advisory services, know-how, and housing market analyses to facilitate this.

In the area which I am from, New Jersey, we had the closing down of the Mack Truck facilities. We had 3,000 workers put out of a job. I do not think it is coincidental that Plainfield was one of the cities in which there were significant riot activities. Again, the company was willing to move a significant number of its workers. There was no facilitating matrix that the company unions could turn to to facilitate this interstate move.

I am perhaps casting a rather long net here, but I am reasonably sure that the know-how gained through this type of implementing legislation will have its greatest significance in the years to come not as a followup of urban problems and rural problems, but because of technological dislocation. This means that we cannot simply put the program into the mainstream and think of it as being a finished program. What is required is a continuous updating and auditing of our approaches (and in the area of auditing I must say that Government facilities in general have been lugubriously bad).

We simply do not have adequate statistical information on what has happened as a function of relocation. This has permitted a variety of nonsense type appraisals of relocation, among them that all relocation is bad. If we view this relocation challenge as a constant, I think the necessity of accompanying it with continuous auditing procedures is very clear cut.

I have some comments which are specific, actually, to Mr. Hughes' suggestions on the bill. I have stated these in brief form at the tail end of my testimony. Let me leave those stand for the record and receive any questions which you might have.

Senator MUSKIE. Thank you very much. I do have a few questions.