

assistance available to families displaced by urban renewal and those displaced by federally assisted highways. In fact, until 1962, the Federal highway program, unlike urban renewal, imposed no obligation either on the Federal Government or on the States to provide any relocation assistance.

Although the Federal highway program now provides some degrees of assistance to the families it displaces, other programs, such as those administered by the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration, still carry no provisions for any relocation assistance, either financial or advisory. As the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other agencies have demonstrated, these disparities exist among a wide variety of programs—Federal, State, and local—that involve displacement. Urban renewal, which has received more than its fair share of criticism for the inadequacies of its relocation assistance program, actually provides the broadest and most comprehensive range of assistance of any Federal or federally assisted program, including compensation for moving expenses, relocation adjustment payments of up to \$500, and advisory assistance to families who are displaced.

Title VIII would establish uniform standards for relocation assistance which all Federal or federally assisted programs would be required to satisfy. To a large extent, these standards would be based on the current relocation assistance provisions contained in the urban renewal law. For example, section 803(c), relating to relocation assistance programs, is virtually identical to the provisions now applicable to urban renewal. The bill also seeks to raise the level of assistance beyond that currently available under urban renewal or any other program. For example, section 802(e) would provide for payments to displaced families in amounts up to \$1,000 over a 2-year period to assist them in securing decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

We believe the necessity for establishing uniform relocation assistance in all Federal and federally assisted programs involving displacement, and for improving the quality of assistance available to displaced families, has been amply demonstrated. Title VIII represents needed legislation.

We wish to point out, however, that the problem of relocation does not exist in a vacuum, but is a part of the entire process by which families and businessmen are uprooted through the impersonal use of governmental power. Relocation assistance, in the form of money or guidance, cannot adequately compensate people whose homes and businesses have been sacrificed, with little or no opportunity for protest, in favor of such presumably higher public interests as more efficient and use or the enlargement of suburban highway arteries—particularly when they receive no real benefit from these public improvements. By the same token, the problem of relocation cannot realistically be viewed separately from other problems facing our cities—problems of inadequate housing and of growing racial and economic separation—to which relocation is closely tied. Nor can the problem of relocation be fully resolved unless corrective action also is taken to eliminate other inequities and to provide for more basic change in the nature of urban society.

Programs of public improvement have a variety of purposes and effects, sometimes inconsistent with one another. For example, the