

Urban renewal should serve the needs of the whole community, but unfortunately, it has not always done so.

Advocates of Federal urban renewal have too often flooded the news media with good intentions and platitudes.

Urban renewal now exists upon large amounts of public moneys and Government power, but too little public or individual support.

Urban renewal is expensive.

Urban renewal is not a free Federal bonanza. We pay dearly for it through Federal taxes. The local community pays heavily also. Urban renewal projects are not done cheaply. Enormous profits have been made in urban renewal, but not for the community and the taxpayer who care about the expense.

The typical urban renewal project destroys a great many homes—at least 126,000 between 1950 and 1960. Twenty-five thousand of these were in good condition. In the 1950 decade, no more than 30,000 units were constructed in urban renewal project areas. One hundred and twenty-six thousand down; thirty thousand up. Unfortunately, for the dislocated families who must find a place to live the 30,000 put up were out of the reach of their pocketbooks. The community cares about this.

Families displaced from an urban renewal area find it practically impossible to move back into the area. Rents in the renewed area go up, but the tenant's wherewithal does not. Many of the displaced families move to less favorable homes—less space, worse conditions, but they pay higher rents, for less desirable locations. Thus, the net effect of urban renewal in the field of housing has not been helpful. The community cares about its displaced persons.

At least 1 million persons have been evicted. The manner of the eviction is not always pleasant or decent. You should know about the infamous *Patania* case in my district. The urban renewal project is 6 years old. Mr. Patania is 72. He and his wife lived in their modest home for 42 years. It was in good condition, but in an area designated for commercial urban renewal. They were offered the fair market value of their home—\$12,500, I think—not nearly adequate to replace their home today. They declined. They were ordered evicted. They refused to leave. The sheriff was ordered to evict them. Mrs. Patania was forcibly subdued, placed in a straitjacket, and removed via stretcher—under the gaze of nationwide television and other reporters. Mr. Patania was forcibly removed also. Then, to add to their ignominy, both were jailed until their home was bulldozed to the ground to prevent their reentry. They have also been sued for contempt of court and damages for the costs of the evictions and the special, premature demolition of their home. Urban renewal had little compassion for this old couple who could not speak English and who only wanted to keep their most valuable and precious possession (next to life itself)—their home of 42 years. Urban renewal did not have compassion. Urban renewal could not devise a better way to relocate the Patanias. Urban renewal didn't care about people; it cared only about clearing property.

Now the community should and does care about evicted people and how it is done and where they relocate. Relocation is not just a worry for the evicted family, but a concern and burden of the community which cannot be discharged simply by paying money. The community cares.