

Camden Public Housing Authority must use the authority it has to immediately rehabilitate at least 100 houses which are presently privately owned. The new Property Maintenance Code passed by the Camden City Council contains provisions which would facilitate the rehabilitation of privately owned property. The City must be forced to use the provisions to meet the housing needs of Camden. A city cannot tear down thousands of houses in three or four years without building replacement housing and maintain that no housing crisis exists. Your Department can help by bringing together representatives from the city government, the State government and federal government, grass roots people, civil rights leaders, clergy, business, industry, and labor to map out a plan to provide Camden with the low income housing it needs.

Mr. Hummel states: "The City is taking measures to increase the supply of standard housing for low and moderate income families." Except for housing for the aged, we are unaware of these measures and would like to be informed just what they are. Low income housing must be provided for the generation presently leaving school if Camden is to stem the flow of young people from this city.

We would also like to point out to Mr. Hummel that while there may be "an increased use by the New Jersey Highway Department of the services offered by the Urban Renewal Division in Camden," we believe that overall no more than 5% of the people displaced by highway construction in Camden are being presently referred to Urban Renewal.

In his report Mr. Hummel states: "The Urban Renewal Division has been reasonably successful in relocating families displaced under its programs and those referred to it by the Highway Department." We believe that recent events make a complete and exhaustive investigation of its activities, procedures, and resources in Camden mandatory.

In order to fully understand the relocation crisis in Camden one must understand the relationship between the City Department of Welfare and the Urban Renewal Relocation Office of the Camden Public Housing Authority. The City of Camden has a contractual relationship with Urban Renewal for the latter to relocate for a fee of \$40 per referral all persons displaced by code enforcement who request such relocation help. First, we charge that Mr. McHugh of the Urban Renewal Relocation Office has knowingly relocated at least one family in a house which was rat-infested, had a leaky roof, faulty electrical circuits, inadequate ventilation, and was full of filth and refuse left by the previous occupants. In addition, this house is in the path of a future highway. Second, we charge that the Urban Renewal Relocation Office has been derelict in fulfilling its obligations. During the week of May 29, 1967, fire broke out in 410 Haddon Avenue. The building was closed to human habitation. On Friday, June 2, 1967, tenants displaced by the fire were referred to Mr. McHugh of the relocation office by the city for immediate relocation. The impression was given the city that these people would be immediately relocated. However, Mr. McHugh when confronted by the tenants told them he could not help them that afternoon, but would meet them at 9:00 A.M. Saturday morning in front of 410. Later that evening the homeless tenants came to us for help. The City Business Administrator was reached and after futile attempts to contact Mr. McHugh, he agreed to put the tenants up at a hotel in the city. Saturday morning Mr. McHugh failed to appear and the tenants remained in the hotel for the whole weekend. Third, we charge that the Camden Urban Renewal Relocation Office functions on a prejudicial basis, constantly insulting through its behavior and by word members of minority groups. Many leaders of the Coalition when trying to obtain help for people displaced by governmental action have been told that these people are dirty, prostitutes, immoral, drunkards, etc. In some cases displacees have been told to their faces that there was no housing immediately available for them, but that there were houses available for "good" and "clean" people. Fourth, we charge that the City Department of Welfare has frustrated displaced tenants in their attempts to obtain relocation aid and has tried to relocate tenants themselves in order to avoid paying the \$40.00 referral fee. In Mid-May a mother of a family of eight was refused referral to Urban Renewal by her case worker's supervisor to avoid paying the fee. The same woman was referred by city welfare to a house which has sewer rats roaming the basement. It was only after we contacted the Business Administrator that this family received its proper referral. Fifth, we charge that county and city welfare in trying to themselves relocate families have housed families in indecent, inhuman, and unfit housing. In one case a woman was moved into a house with boarded windows. In a second case, one family was moved into a house which lacked adequate heating, kitchen, and electrical facilities and in which the kitchen ceiling