

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act has a clear congressional mandate. It specifically states "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." The relationship of title VI to urban problems is well documented in an excellent pamphlet entitled "Metropolitan Housing Desegregation," by John Silard and Arthur Levin, published by the Potomac Institute.

The authors demonstrate that many thousands of families are displaced from their homes every year by federally financed projects under the workable program for community improvement and other governmental activities.

The authors of the pamphlet suggest a modest but firm positive program for housing desegregation, which ADA fully supports. We request that this program be made part of the hearing record.

We strongly urge that the committee report specifically state that title VI enforcement vigorously be stepped up along the lines outlined in the Silard and Levin pamphlet.

Congress has acted. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the law of the land. This congressional mandate should not be undermined by nonenforcement by HUD and other Federal agencies.

Next, I would like to turn to recommended changes on H.R. 12341, H.R. 12939, and H.R. 13064. Mr. Chairman, I now would like to discuss specific amendments to the legislation under consideration. We urge that H.R. 12341, H.R. 12939, and H.R. 13064 be combined and be reported out as a clean bill.

1. We support the Ruess-Ashley-Moorhead amendment that would require two additional criteria for fund eligibility.

First, cities that have "economic and social pressures such as those involving or resulting from population density, crime rate, public welfare participation, delinquency, poverty, unemployment, education levels, health and disease characteristics, and substandard housing" should have priority in receiving funds.

Second, to receive funds such neighborhoods should have a workable program such as is currently required for receiving urban renewal funds. This amendment will help assure that the legislation achieves its stated social purpose.

2. Any city that meets the criteria specified in the demonstration cities program should be eligible for receiving funds. More than one neighborhood in a city, if it is otherwise eligible, should be receiving funds. We believe it is socially explosive to limit the program to just one neighborhood in each eligible city. In short, public policy should not force a city to choose between its Harlem, South Bronx, and Bedford-Stuyvesant.

3. The bill's purpose should specifically call for dispersal of racial and income ghettos. The legislation should deliberately promote residential integration of both different income classes and racial groups. Cities should be required to show that these proposals would not lead to greater segregation in the affected neighborhoods and in the city.

4. We believe that comprehensive city demonstration programs should include as one of the criteria for funding subsections (1)(5) inclusive of section 4(c). We support a deletion on page 5 of lines