

I am a Puerto Rican born in the United States, and I wanted to go back to Puerto Rico. When I went to Puerto Rico for a visit, I found out that you are there also. You have taken over also the Puerto Rican country. It was an agricultural country. Now it has become an industrial country. So it looks like we are stuck with the United States.

If we are stuck with the United States, brother, we are going to fight you also in this country.

All I am going to say is I wish you people would take a walk, just a walk, to the Poor Peoples' movement. I have, in my own houses. I have 18 people from my own neighborhood, just the poor people here. We are building our own house over there. I want to tell you it looks better than anything we have in Brownsville. We have something better than anything in Williamsburgh, which is middle class.

We are going to stay there. That is all I have to say. If you have any questions, ask.

Miss WRIGHT. There are two or three things from these discussions which I shall point out. Again from a cursory reading of the bill, do you see any reason why you cannot include in the law that people are not to be removed in urban renewal until adequate housing has been guaranteed to them and, in fact, these people have been relocated in adequate housing? It seems to me again the thing that strikes me about the whole bill is how few social as opposed to technical, values are included.

A city planning friend of mine tells me how much goes into planning a zoo—the animals must have the right temperature, they must have the right atmosphere. They have to have everything of the right size so that the animals can grow and be happy in the zoo. We do not give that much consideration to people.

It seems to me we are concerned about highways. Why is it that we cannot write a law that people shall not be moved from one slum to another until adequate housing can be found for the people and they in fact shall be moved into adequate housing before an urban renewal program can come into force? I do not see any problem with that. It seems to me that is the minimal protection that we can give to these people.

The second thing that worries me a lot, which is good in theory but not in actual practice, is your emphasis on trying to get more State responsibility and you talk about having to consult with and get approval of the local governmental agencies before instituting Federal programs. That is very well, and I would like to see that, assuming you have very strong, built-in guidelines that the States must follow and comply with, and assuming you have procedural systems for review built in. One of the things I would like to ask is that a review system include adequate hearing procedures, because it seems to me that Agriculture, HEW, and a few other agencies of the Government do not have clear hearing procedures. I have asked for hearings at the HEW—a few years ago—and we have gotten no response. Some say that there is no hearing procedure for the public; some say there is but it is so unwieldy that they avoid using it where possible.

Why cannot we write in clear hearing procedures so that people can bring up violations of programs?

Lastly, because the political pressure is so often so difficult to deal with, why cannot we have a system for judicial review of certain pro-