

I recall how in the first program in the 1940's under title I, where there were relocation plans and relocation staffs aiding people as well as moving expenses.

In the 1950's we in Philadelphia were one of many who set up a centralized relocation bureau without any urging on the part of the Federal Government because we saw the need as other programs were beginning to have an impact on dislocation.

In the 1960's, our relocation agencies were the ones who were knocking on the doors of HAFA on having more social workers, more people who understood the minority problems in dislocation. But now we recognize that there is a kind of new frontier: the need to face up to compensation over and above market value because of the hardship; the need to recognize that displacement is a human problem of psychology and attitude toward neighborhoods and institutions in those neighborhoods; the need to have Government agencies, in a sense recognize that it is a fundamental cause of their program, and as much of a public service to take care of individuals being displaced for that public improvement. Perhaps most important of all, is to provide resources for relocation because it is in access to resources that relocation programs will fall or stand up.

If we do not have a housing supply for those displaced, we do not see how any improvement in procedure is going to do the job, and so there must be a parallel increase in housing supply. Nevertheless, all of us who have worked in this field recognize that there are many improvements that can be made under the relocation bill.

We endorse very much what you have in title VIII in terms of a uniform relocation provision, because we know that one person displaced by one agency as against another, just does not understand the need for the difference. We would like to go beyond that. We would like to see, for example, in urban renewal programs, and in public housing programs, the right to begin actual relocation work during the survey and planning period. There is a tremendous hardship on individuals who wait for the plan to be completed. If one family moves out, the people next door are subject to vandalized property, to the uncleanness, to the rats that may be there. We feel that there ought to be a flexibility and a willingness to supply the funds to start early. It does not increase the cost, and in some ways it might reduce it, and certainly reduce the hardship on the individual.

We have asked HUD on a number of occasions that this might be relaxed and they have been unable to do so, pointing to the legal requirements of having a formally-approved plan.

But, once we have said that, we begin to recognize that the relocation problem cannot be confined to those who are formally displaced by Government programs. Those who are displaced get the kind of special help that we provide and take away from the housing market those units which are needed for families of low income who are not able to adjust well to an urban area.

And perhaps the time has come to look at relocation in the terms of a continuing program, a program where a community aided with Federal funds, can have a standing operation studying the housing supply, making recommendations where that supply ought to be increased, and trying to fit the public programs that result in dislocation into what is happening in that community on a regular basis.