renewal officials; 25,000 were sound homes in good condition, some of them in excellent condition. Only about 28,000 housing units were built; 25,000 of them are privately owned, the rest are public housing units. Thus about four times as many homes were destroyed as were built. Those destroyed were predominantly low-rent homes, those built were predominantly high-rent homes.

"As of March 31, 1963, about 609,000 people had been evicted from their homes. I estimate that 1 million will have been evicted by the end of 1965. And, according to the Commissioner of Urban Renewal Administration, around 4 million will be displaced by 1972, or 1 out of every 50 persons living in the United States."

As to this shortcoming, there are a few brief pertinent references in the bill. Section 4(b) (1) would require a finding by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development that "the program is of sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions * * * (ii) to provide a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost * * *" Section 4(b) (2) would require a finding by the Secretary that "the rebuilding or restoration of sections of neighborhoods in accordance with the program will contribute to a well-balanced city with * * * housing for all income levels; * * *" Section 4(b) (7) would require a finding by the Secretary that "the program is designed to assure maximum opportunity in the choice of housing accommodations by all citizens; * * *" Section 4(c) directs the Secretary to give maximum consideration to, among other things, whether "the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques" and whether "the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income."

The difficulty with these references is that they are all stated in rather nebulous terms and constitute no more than declarations of good intentions such as have been associated with other programs which fell short of the mark. The vagueness of the terms is exceedingly great, with the result that everything is left to the unchallengeable discretion of the Secretary. These are terms such as "sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions," "substantial increase," "low and moderate cost," "well-balanced city," "housing for all income levels," "maximum use of new and improved technology and design," and "cost reduction techniques." In addition, a finding by the Secretary that a program will do such and such is no guarantee that such and such will actually happen any more than it happened under existing programs. For example, if it occurs that a trade union restrictive practice conflicts with the "maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques," it is going to take more than a finding by the Secretary to resolve the conflict.

3. *Failure to achieve benefits commensurate with the vast expenditures involved.*—This is acknowledged, in a rather negative way, in the President's message by the statement that "The size and scale of urban assistance has been too small, and too widely dispersed." Dr. Anderson also refers to the fact that "FURP (Federal urban renewal program) is very expensive. Many billions have already been spent, and the plans call for vastly increased spending." Time magazine for March 4, 1966, reports the Federal subsidy since 1949 as $4.7 billion.

It should be noted that section 12 of the bill provides that "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." In other words, there would be no statutory limitation on the amount of money which could be spent under this program. The administration has called for a $2.3 billion program over 6 years, but a number of mayors have already advocated vastly increased expenditures. Consequently, as a practical matter, there would appear to be no effective limitation as to the untold billions of dollars of expenditures to which the Congress would be committing itself by the passage of this legislation. Human Events for March 12, 1966 states that "experts say the real figure will be at least $10 billion, and probably more." At a time when national defense requirements appear to be growing and there is need for fiscal restraint on the part of the National Government to avoid runaway inflation, the Congress should reject this type of open end, blank check, bottomless pit financial commitment. If the Congress could refrain from this type of legislation, it would be a constructive contribution toward averting a possible tax increase. Also it should be noted that there are no savings involved in this program due to eliminating other programs, functions or positions since it would be superimposed on everything that is already in existence. It is clear that this bill could cause the expenditure of billions of dollars without any more assurance of commensurate benetfis than was had under prior programs.