Testimony of Dan Alban
Attorney, Institute for Justice
www.ij.org

United States House Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution & Civil Justice

Hearing on "The State of Property Rights in America
Ten Years After *Kelo v. City of New London*"

July 9, 2015

Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding eminent domain abuse, an important issue that has received significant national attention as a result of the United States Supreme Court's universally reviled decision in *Kelo v. City of New London*, which was handed down ten years ago in June. This committee is to be commended for responding to the American people by continuing to examine this misuse of government power to violate the property rights of many Americans.

My name is Dan Alban, and I am an attorney at the Institute for Justice, a nationwide, nonprofit public interest law firm headquartered in Arlington, Virginia that represents people whose rights are being violated by the government. One of the main areas in which we litigate is property rights, particularly in cases where homes or small businesses are taken by the government through the power of eminent domain and transferred to another private party. I have personally represented property owners across the country—from National City, California to Atlantic City, New Jersey—who are fighting eminent domain for private use.

Perhaps most notably, the Institute for Justice represented the homeowners in *Kelo v. City of New London,* the notorious 2005 case in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled by a bare majority that eminent domain could be used to transfer perfectly fine private property to a private developer based simply on the mere promise of increased tax revenue. On its tenth anniversary in late June, law professors, legal commentators, and other observers described *Kelo* as "one of the Supreme Court's most controversial modern decisions…a grave error," "truly horrible," "one of the most destructive and appalling decisions of the modern era," and "the worst Supreme Court decision of the 21st Century."[1]

The *Kelo* case demonstrated that a majority of justices sitting on the Supreme Court believed the U.S. Constitution provides very little protection for the private property rights of Americans faced with eminent domain abuse. Indeed, the Court ruled that it is acceptable to use the power of eminent domain when there is a mere *possibility* that something else could make more money than the homes or small businesses that currently occupy the land. It's no wonder, then, that the decision caused Justice Sandra Day O'Connor to remark in her dissent: "The specter of condemnation hangs over all property. Nothing is to prevent the State from replacing any Motel 6 with a Ritz-Carlton, any home with a shopping center, or any farm with a factory."

Justice O'Connor further warned in her dissent that "the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms. As for the victims, the government now has license to transfer property from those with fewer resources to those with more."

---

[1] Prof. Ilya Somin, *The Grasping Hand:* Kelo v. City of New London *and the Limits of Eminent Domain*, American Constitution Society ACSblog, June 23, 2015, http://www.acslaw.org/acsblog/the-grasping-hand-kelo-v-city-of-new-london-and-the-limits-of-eminent-domain; Prof. Richard Epstein, Kelo v. City of New London *Ten Years Later*, National Review, June 23, 2015, http://www.nationalreview.com/article/420144/kelo-v-city-new-london-ten-years-later-richard-epstein; Damon Root, *The* Kelo *Debacle Turns 10*, Reason Hit & Run Blog, June 23, 2015, http://reason.com/blog/2015/06/23/the-kelo-debacle-turns-10; David Burge, Iowa Hawk Blog Twitter Account, June 23, 2015, https://twitter.com/iowahawkblog/status/613340586653777920.

An Institute for Justice study confirmed Justice O'Connor's concerns, finding that eminent domain disproportionately impacts minorities, the less educated, and the less well-off.[2] As Justice O'Connor concluded her dissent in *Kelo*: "The Founders cannot have intended this perverse result."

In part because of the threat posed to the rights of everyday Americans—particularly those disadvantaged by a lack of financial resources and political influence—there has been a considerable public outcry against the closely divided *Kelo* decision. Organizations spanning the political spectrum have united in opposition to eminent domain abuse, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, League of United Latin American Citizens, the Farm Bureau, and the National Federation of Independent Business. Overwhelming majorities in every major poll taken after the *Kelo* decision have condemned the result, and it continues to be wildly unpopular ten years after the case was decided. 44 states have reformed their eminent domain laws in the wake of the decision. Nine state supreme courts have made it more difficult for the government to engage in eminent domain abuse, and three of those have explicitly rejected *Kelo*.

Unfortunately, while several bills have been introduced in both the House and the Senate to combat the abuse of eminent domain with significant bipartisan support, Congress has yet to pass any legislation that enacts any meaningful reform. The federal government should not be complicit in an abuse of power already deemed intolerable by most states; Congress should take action to prevent federal dollars from being used to fund projects that abuse the power of eminent domain by taking property from one private person to give to another.

Before Kelo, the use of eminent domain for private development had grown to become a nationwide problem, and the Court's decision quickly encouraged further abuse.

Eminent domain, called the "despotic power" in the early days of this country, is the power to force citizens from their homes, small businesses, churches and farms. Because the Founders were conscious of the possibility of abuse, the Fifth Amendment provides a very simple restriction: "[N]or shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

Historically, with very few limited exceptions, the power of eminent domain was used for things the public actually owned or used—schools, courthouses, post offices and the like. Over the past 60 years, however, the meaning of "public use" has been stretched past its breaking point by courts that have abdicated their role to enforce this important constitutional limitation on the power of eminent domain. Today, the courts have redefined "public use" to mean any "public purpose," which includes ordinary private uses like luxury condominiums and big-box stores.

The expansion of the public-use doctrine began with the urban renewal movement of the 1950s. In order to remove so-called "slum" neighborhoods, cities were authorized to use the power of

[2] *See* Dick M. Carpenter & John K. Ross, *Victimizing the Vulnerable: The Demographics of Eminent Domain Abuse,* June 2007, http://www.ij.org/1621; *see also* Dick M. Carpenter & John K. Ross, *Testing O'Connor and Thomas: Does the Use of Eminent Domain Target Poor and Minority Communities?*, Urban Studies, Oct. 2009, vol. 46, no. 11, at 2247-2461, http://www.thecyberhood.net/documents/papers/carpenter09.pdf.

eminent domain. Urban renewal wiped out entire communities, most typically African-American communities, earning eminent domain the nickname "negro removal."[3]

This "solution," which critics and proponents of urban renewal alike consider a dismal failure, was given ultimate approval by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 in *Berman v. Parker.* The Court ruled that the removal of blight was a public "purpose," despite the fact that the word "purpose" appears nowhere in the text of the Constitution and government already possessed the power—and still does—to remove blighted properties through public nuisance law. By effectively changing the wording of the Fifth Amendment, the Court opened up a Pandora's box, and in the wake of that decision properties were routinely taken pursuant to redevelopment statutes when there was absolutely nothing wrong with them, except that some well-heeled developer covets them and the government hoped to increase its tax revenue.

The use of eminent domain for private development was widespread. In the five-year period between 1998 and 2002, we documented more than 10,000 properties either seized or threatened with condemnation for private development.[4] Because this number was reached by counting properties listed in news articles and cases, it grossly underestimates the number of condemnations and threatened condemnations. For example, in Connecticut, we found 31, while the true number of condemnations was 543.

After the Supreme Court actually sanctioned this abuse in *Kelo*, the floodgates opened; the rate of eminent domain abuse tripled in the one year after the decision was issued.[5] With the high court's blessing, local government became further emboldened to take property for private development. For example:

- Freeport, Texas: Hours after the *Kelo* decision, officials in Freeport began legal filings to seize some waterfront businesses (two seafood companies) to make way for others (an $8 million private boat marina).
- Oakland, Calif.: A week after the Supreme Court's ruling in 2005, Oakland city officials used eminent domain to evict John Revelli from the downtown tire shop his family had owned since 1949. Revelli and a neighboring business owner had refused to sell their property to make way for a new housing development. Said Revelli of his fight with the city, "We thought we'd win, but the Supreme Court took away our last chance."
- Hollywood, Fla.: Twice in one month, Hollywood officials used eminent domain to take private property and give it to a developer for private gain. Empowered by the *Kelo* ruling, City commissioners took a bank parking lot to make way for an exclusive condo tower. When asked what the public purpose of the taking was, City Attorney Dan Abbott didn't hesitate before answering, "Economic development, which is a legitimate public purpose according to the United States Supreme Court."

---

[3] *See* Dr. Mindy Fullilove, *Eminent Domain & African Americans: What is the Price of the Commons?*, Feb. 14, 2007, http://castlecoalition.org/pdf/publications/Perspectives-Fullilove.pdf.

[4] *See* Dana Berliner, *Public Power, Private Gain: A Five-Year State By State Report Examining the Abuses of Eminent Domain*, April 2003, http://castlecoalition.org/public-power-private-gain.

[5] *See* Dana Berliner, *Opening the Floodgates: Eminent Domain Abuse In the Post*-Kelo *World*, June 2006, http://castlecoalition.org/pdf/publications/floodgates-report.pdf.

- Arnold, Mo.: The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reported that Arnold Mayor Mark Powell "applauded the [*Kelo*] decision." The City of Arnold wanted to raze 30 homes and 15 small businesses, including the Arnold VFW, for a Lowe's Home Improvement store and a strip mall—a $55 million project for which developer THF Realty would receive $21 million in tax-increment financing. Powell said that for "cash-strapped" cities like Arnold, enticing commercial development is just as important as other public improvements.
- Sunset Hills, Mo.: Less than three weeks after the *Kelo* ruling, Sunset Hills officials voted to allow the condemnation of 85 homes and small businesses for a shopping center and office complex.
- Mount Holly, N.J.: For over a decade, township officials used the threat of eminent domain to systematically dismantle the Gardens, a lower-income, tight-knit neighborhood once home to over 300 row houses. Officials wanted to replace the well-kept and treasured homes with newer, fancier town homes.

More recent abuses include:

- New York, N.Y.: In 2010, the New York Court of Appeals—the state's highest court—allowed the condemnation of perfectly fine homes and businesses for two separate projects. First, a new basketball arena and residential and office towers in Brooklyn, and then for the expansion of Columbia University—an elite, private institution—into Harlem.
- Philadelphia, Penn.: Starting in 2012, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (PRA) sought to condemn the art studio of world-renowned artist James Dupree to pave the way for a new grocery store. The city initially seized his deed just four days before a loophole in the state's post-*Kelo* eminent domain reform was closed, which would have protected the owner from the taking. After a long campaign of grassroots activism, the PRA finally relented and terminated the condemnation proceedings in early 2015.
- Atlantic City, N.J.: New Jersey's Casino Reinvestment Development Authority (CRDA) has long abused its eminent domain powers for the benefit of casinos and continues to do so in a large swath of Atlantic City designated as the Tourism District. In spring 2014, CRDA filed condemnation papers against 62 properties in the South Inlet neighborhood near the Boardwalk, including the well-kept longtime family home of Institute for Justice client Charlie Birnbaum, in what appears to be a "bulldoze first, plan later" scheme. Unlike in *Kelo*—where there was a development plan for the proposed taking—CRDA admits it has no specific development plans for the area and merely says it is for a "mixed-use development" that is intended to "complement the new Revel Casino and assist with the demands created by the resort." But the $2.4 billion Revel Casino has filed twice for bankruptcy and closed in early September 2014. Despite this turn of events, CRDA is still trying to seize the Birnbaum house for unspecified and unknown "Tourism District uses," even though the current residential use is a permitted use in the Tourism District. The case is still pending.
- Charlestown, Ind.: In 2014, the mayor of Charlestown was prepared to use eminent domain to seize 354 well-kept homes—an entire working-class neighborhood, called Pleasant Ridge—in order to transfer the land to a private developer for new homes and retail. Fortunately, grassroots activists ultimately brought those plans to a halt.

- Glendale, Colo.: In 2015, the city council authorized its urban renewal authority to condemn Authentic Persian Rugs, a popular, successful store on the busiest road in Denver. The mayor wants to hand this family business and surrounding property over to a private developer for an entertainment district.

As mentioned above, heeding a deafening public outcry against eminent domain abuse, 45 states have reformed their eminent domain laws in the wake of *Kelo*. These reforms varied greatly—indeed, no two states enacted the same legislative reforms. Eminent domain abuse has become virtually non-existent in some states, and in others there remains much room for improvement. Alabama recently passed legislation to roll back its eminent domain reform, after being the first state to react legislatively to give its citizens stronger protections against this abuse of power after *Kelo.* This demonstrates an ongoing need to remain vigilant in the fight against eminent domain abuse.

Congress should take this opportunity to stop being complicit in eminent domain abuse where it exists and where it may reappear in the future by restricting federal funds from being used where the power of eminent domain is abused for private development.

Despite the nationwide revolt against *Kelo*, federal action is still needed,
as federal law and funds currently support eminent domain for private development.

Federal agencies themselves rarely if ever take property for private projects, but federal funds support condemnations and support agencies that take property from one person to give it to another. There has been improvement from state legislative reform, but not enough. Although eminent domain for private development is less of a problem in nearly half of the states in the wake of *Kelo,* it remains a major problem in many other states. Unfortunately, some of the states that were the worst before *Kelo* in terms of eminent domain abuse did little or nothing to reform their laws. New York remains the worst state in the country on this issue, and it has gotten even worse since *Kelo*. Missouri, also a major abuser, passed only weak reform, as did Illinois. In other states, like Washington and Texas, the prospect of federal money for Transit Oriented Development has inspired municipalities to seek enormous areas for private development (areas not needed for the actual transportation). Eminent domain abuse is still a problem, and federal money continues to support the use of eminent domain for private commercial development. A few examples of how federal funds have been used to support private development include:

- New London, Conn.: This was the case that was the subject of the Supreme Court's *Kelo* decision. Fifteen homes were taken for a private development project that was planned to include a hotel, upscale condominiums, and office space. The project received $2 million in funds from the federal Economic Development Authority—and ultimately failed. The former neighborhood remains an empty lot, over a decade later.
- Brea, Calif.: The Brea Redevelopment Agency demolished the city's entire downtown residential area, using eminent domain to force out hundreds of lower-income residents. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) launched an investigation into the potential misappropriation of federal development grants totaling at least $400,000, which made their way to the city in the late 1980s and early 1990s. FBI agents

investigated the Redevelopment Agency based on evidence that the Agency used coercive tactics to acquire property.

- Garden Grove, Calif.: Garden Grove has used $17.7 million in federal housing funds to support its hotel development efforts—efforts that included, at least in part, the use of eminent domain. In 1998, the City Council declared 20 percent of the city "blighted," a move that allowed the city to use eminent domain for private development. Using that power—and federal money—the city acquired a number of properties, including a mobile-home park full of senior citizens, apartment renters and small businesses, in order to provide room for hotel development.
- National City, Calif.: In 2007, the National City Community Development Commission, which received significant federal funding, authorized the use of eminent domain over nearly 700 properties in its downtown area, calling the area "blighted." One of the planned projects was the replacement of the Community Youth Athletic Center, a boxing gym and mentoring program for at-risk youth, with an upscale condominium project. Fortunately after years of hard-fought litigation by the Institute for Justice, we prevailed in getting the blight designation struck down.
- Normal, Ill.: Normal officials condemned the properties of Orval and Bill Yarger and Alex Wade, including the Broadway Mall, for a Marriott Hotel and accompanying conference center being built by an out-of-town developer. The town secured at least $2 million in federal funding for downtown projects, and once the cost of the Marriott nearly doubled, approved giving the developer $400,000 in Community Development Block Grant money.
- Baltimore, Md.: In December 2002, the Baltimore City Council passed legislation that gave the city the power to condemn up to 3,000 properties for a redevelopment project anchored by a biotechnology research park. The development is supposed to contain space for biotech companies, retail, restaurants and a variety of housing options. HUD provided a $21.2 million loan to the city. Nearly thirteen years later, the project is still under construction and much of the seized land remains vacant. Many projects in Baltimore involving the use of eminent domain for private development are overseen by the Baltimore Development Corporation, which receives federal funding.
- Somerville, Mass.: In October 2012, Somerville authorized the use of eminent domain over a 117-acre neighborhood, identifying seven blocks with 35 properties to be acquired first. The Union Square Revitalization Plan is a transit-oriented development with residences, retail, restaurants and office space. The city has received at least $29 million in stimulus funds and around $35 million in other federal and state funding. The owner of a threatened gym said that he believes in the revitalization of Union Square through private means: "That's why I purchased the property." But he said it would be difficult to develop his business with "the threat of seizure hanging over our head." The project is currently moving forward.
- St. Louis, Mo.: In 2003 and 2004, the Garden District Commission and the McRee Town Redevelopment Corporation demolished six square blocks of buildings, including approximately 200 units of housing, some run by local non-profits. The older housing was to be replaced by luxury housing. The project received at least $3 million in Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds, and may have received another $3 million in block grant funds as well.

- Elmira, N.Y.: Eight properties—including apartments, a garage, carriage house and the former Hygeia Refrigerating Co.—were condemned and six were purchased under the threat of eminent domain for Elmira's South Main Street Street Urban Development project. HUD funds were used to create a 6.38-acre lot for development.
- Mount Vernon, N.Y.: In October 2012, this suburb of New York City declared almost eight acres in a neighborhood that is 90 percent black "blighted" and subject to condemnation. The blight study was paid for by the developer who wants to build there. Threatened properties include homes, churches, and businesses including a daycare with a well-maintained playground, a nail salon, delis, a Jamaican restaurant, and small grocery stores. Mount Vernon received at least $1.7 million in CDBG and HOME funds in 2012.
- New Cassell, N.Y.: St. Luke's Pentecostal Church saved for more than a decade to purchase property and move out of the rented basement where it held services. It bought a piece of property to build a permanent home for the congregation. The property was condemned by the North Hempstead Community Development Agency, which administers funding from HUD, for the purpose of private retail development. The land remained vacant for at least six years.
- New York, N.Y.: Developer Douglas Durst and Bank of America enlisted the Empire State Development Corporation to clear a block of midtown Manhattan for their 55-story Bank of America Tower at One Bryant Park. The ESDC put at least 32 properties under threat of condemnation and initiated eminent domain proceedings. All of the owners eventually sold. Durst had abandoned the project prior to 9/11, but an infusion of public subsidies—including $650 million in the form of Liberty Bonds—and a $1 billion deal with Bank of America put plans back on track.
- Ardmore, Pa.: The Ardmore Transit Center Project had some actual transportation purposes, but Lower Merion Township officials also planned to remove several historic local businesses, many with apartments on the upper floors, so that they could be replaced with mall stores and upscale apartments. The project received $6 million in federal funding, which went to the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority. But for a tirelessly waged grassroots battle—which no American should have to wage to keep what is rightfully theirs—that ultimately stopped the project, the federal government would have been complicit in the destruction of successful, family-owned small businesses.
- Washington, D.C.: The National Capital Revitalization Corporation received $28 million in HUD funds to buy or seize up to 18 acres of land for a private developer to replace old retail with new retail. Over the course of seven years, affected business owners challenged the District in a dozen different eminent domain cases—but the city won or settled every dispute.

Congress can and should take steps to ensure that federal funds do not support the abuse of eminent domain.

The *Kelo* decision continues to cry out for Congressional action, ten years later. Even Justice Stevens, the author of the opinion, stated in a speech that he believes eminent domain for economic development is bad policy and hopes that the country will find a political solution.

Some states did, but those reforms not embedded in state constitutions will always be subject to repeal or exception whenever a pie-in-the-sky project catches the eye of state legislators or local officials. Congress needs to finally make its opposition heard on this issue, and should provide property rights protections to Americans that the Supreme Court denied in 2005.

Congress's previous efforts to restrict the use of certain federal funds for eminent domain (from the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other agencies) have unfortunately been ineffective. In 2005, just after *Kelo* was decided, Senator Christopher Bond (R-Mo.) introduced an appropriations bill amendment that was intended to limit federal funding for eminent domain abuse.[6]

The Bond Amendment purported to restrict the use of funds by HUD and other agencies for projects involving eminent domain to only those projects where eminent domain is employed "only for a public use." The Bond Amendment lists a number of approved public uses, but provides that "public uses shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities."

However, the Bond Amendment has no enforcement mechanism and relies on agencies and grant recipients to police themselves. There does not seem to be any way for individuals to enforce this restriction. Nor does it appear that any of these agencies have ever investigated a violation of the spending limitation or enforced the limitation. Instead, the local governments that receive the funds are expected to understand and apply the prohibition. In other words, the same local governments that are planning to use eminent domain are also expected to limit their own funding, despite the fact that there is no prospect of enforcement. It is therefore not surprising that the funding restriction has not protected the rights of people faced with eminent domain.

The language of the Bond Amendment has reappeared in provisions of appropriations bills for fiscal years 2008, 2009, 2010, 2014, and 2015, and it also appears in the current draft of the bill for FY 2016, which was passed by the House in June and awaits approval by the Senate.[7] Putting teeth in the language of the Bond Amendment by adding an enforcement mechanism would be an important first step toward federal eminent domain reform.

Funding restrictions like the Bond Amendment will only be effective if there exists a procedure for enforcement, so any reform must also include a mechanism by which the economic development funding for the state or local government can be stopped. Part of this procedure should be a private method of enforcement, whether through an agency or court, so that the home owners, small business owners, or tenants who are threatened by the abuse of eminent domain (as well as other interested parties such as local taxpayers), can alert the proper entity and funding can be cut off as appropriate. The diligence of ordinary citizens in the communities where governments are using eminent domain for private development, together with the

[6] The Bond Amendment first appeared as § 726 of the FY 2006 appropriations bill that was signed into law by President Bush on November 30, 2005. *See* Pub. L. No. 109-115, § 726, 119 Stat 2396 (2005).

[7] *See* Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, H. R. 2577, 114th Cong. § 407 (2015), https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/2577/text.

potential sanction of lost federal funding, will most certainly serve to return some sense to state and local eminent domain policy.

Federal funding restrictions that prohibit eminent domain abuse can still allow cities and agencies to continue to receive federal funding when they acquire abandoned property and transfer it to private parties. When the public thinks about "redevelopment," it is most concerned with the ability to deal with abandoned property. With such legislation, cities can continue to clear title to abandoned property and then promote private development there without risking losing their federal funding. Similarly, it may also be useful to have a clear and strictly limited exception for the exercise of eminent domain to remove "harmful uses of land provided such uses constitute an immediate threat to public health and safety" in order to discourage local governments from taking perfectly fine homes and businesses as is common practice under some state's vague blight laws.

Given the climate in the states as a result of *Kelo*, congressional action would do even more to both discourage the abuse of eminent domain nationwide and encourage sensible state-level reform. Reform at the federal level would be a strong statement to the country that this awesome government power should not be abused. It would restore the faith of the American people in their ability to build, own and keep their homes and small businesses, which is itself a commendable goal.

It should also be noted that development occurs every day across the country without eminent domain and will continue to do so should this committee act on this issue, which I recommend. Public works projects like flood control will not be affected by any legislation that properly restricts eminent domain to its traditional uses since those projects are plainly public uses. But commercial developers everywhere need to be told that they can only obtain property through private negotiation, not government force and that the federal government will not be a party to private-to-private transfers of property. As we demonstrated in a 2008 study, restricting eminent domain to its traditional public use in no ways harms economic growth.[8]

Conclusion

Congress should not be sending scarce economic development funds to projects that abuse eminent domain and strip hard-working, tax-paying home and small business owners of their constitutional rights, particularly when these projects may ultimately fail. Let New London be a lesson: After $80 million in taxpayer money spent, years tied up in litigation and ten years after the disastrous U.S. Supreme Court ruling, the Fort Trumbull neighborhood where Susette Kelo's little pink house once stood is now a barren field that is home to nothing but feral cats. The developer balked and abandoned the project. Pfizer—the intended beneficiary of the project—closed its plant and left New London.

---

[8] *See* Institute for Justice, *Doomsday? No Way: Economic Trends and Post*-Kelo *Eminent Domain Reform*, Jan. 2008, http://ij.org/1618; *see also* Dick M. Carpenter & John K. Ross, *Do Restrictions on Eminent Domain Harm Economic Development?*, Economic Development Quarterly, Nov. 2010, Vol. 24, No,. 4, 337-351, http://edq.sagepub.com/content/24/4/337.short.

Eminent domain sounds like an abstract issue, but it affects real people. Real people lose the homes they love and watch as they are replaced with luxury condominiums. Real people lose the businesses they count on to put food on the table and watch as they are replaced with shopping malls. And all this happens because local governments prefer the taxes generated by condos and malls to modest homes and small businesses. Federal law currently allows expending federal funds to support condemnations for the benefit of private developers. By doing so, it encourages this abuse. Using eminent domain so that another richer, better-connected person may live or work on the land you used to own tells Americans that their hopes, dreams and hard work do not matter as much as money and political influence. The use of eminent domain for private development has no place in a country built on traditions of independence, hard work, and the protection of property rights.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee.