

I could go on with these quotations at substantial length. I think if you recall your own experiences in moving, and add together all of those non-budgeted items: the cup hooks in the kitchen cabinet, the lining paper, the weather stripping for a leaky window, the new electric light bulbs and occasional fixture, the piece of furniture which doesn't work out and the new furniture which is required, the electric extension cords, and all of the other items that make a place appropriate for people to live in, that the sheer absolute inadequacy of the \$200 payment—which as you know, must also cover the actual physical costs of moving, are all too clear. We have not incorporated into this balance sheet, the day away from work which not uncommonly is the concomitant of moving. Note many of the relocatees are paid hourly, their moving day wages are not absorbed by the employer.

THE NECESSITY FOR PAYMENT REVISION

The description above certainly does not make happy reading, but notice that this prevails under the very best of circumstances. Under present highway procedures, unless the state has opted for the government program in renewal, the actual payment may be far less. Again, let me point out that these payments currently are only made for those people who hold still until the actual process of renewal and relocation is undertaken.

All too frequently, however, renewal is announced well in advance of its actuality, a neighborhood begins to empty out, landlord maintenance slips very rapidly. As vacancies occur acts of vandalism take place, the street gangs and the derelicts move in, the family, even though it may desperately need financial aid for relocation simply may not be able to tolerate the environment long enough to be entitled to it under present regulation. The ultimate payment generally may barely cover actual out-of-pocket moving costs, with nothing remaining to buffer relocation or repay personal labor.

We presently have the opportunity to reconceptualize the relocation procedure, to make it not the horrendous penalty of being in the path of progress, but rather a handmaiden of progress, a corollary of progress.

At best, there is always the feeling of dislocation. The difficulty of finding new accommodations—the increase in housing costs which are usual have not been touched on here. These factors do not rule out the necessity of relocation, they do, however, make it essential for it to be carefully structured. Certainly big government owes it to little citizen to treat him with all of the deference and consideration possible under the circumstances.

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE STERNLIEB ON S. 698

The remarks which have already been circulated in my prepared statement are essentially in the nature of a preamble to the specifics of the bill S. 698. May I say first that I believe the Bill to be a very important and timely piece of legislation, fully in keeping with the nature of the challenge of the problem. I can add very little to the Bill which is so clearly the product of profound thought and care and preparation. There are, however, several points which, with some diffidence, I would like to touch on. They have to do both with details of the Bill and also with the statement of Phillip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, based on the release of Thursday, May 9.

ON THE PRO-RATING OF THE COSTS OF RELOCATION

Mr. Hughes suggests that the relocation costs be considered part of the land cost and pro-rated under this definition, as is the case presently for other urban renewal costs. I think this is a disastrous step in the wrong direction. The fiscal crisis of local governmental units needs little elaboration here. Suffice it to say that it is precisely those jurisdictions which are most in need, which would be most impacted by this proposal. One of the major inhibitors of renewal efforts is, and sadly enough will be increasingly, the lack of wherewithal by the local government to meet present funding requirements—much less meeting an increased burden as proposed by the Bureau of the Budget.