

these families disappeared from the face of the earth because no provisions were made for them."

From Miami we have another report that the "State Road Department, in removing people for highway construction, did not give sufficient notice of relocation assistance to those displaced. The State legislature did not pass the necessary laws to implement relocation payments, so this money was not available to displaced persons."

Since May 1967, the Miami Urban Renewal Agency has been responsible for the relocation of displaced persons and has made considerable progress toward its goals. The fact remains, however, that the agency does not have the funds for relocation payments.

Report after report, Mr. Chairman, from our local affiliates tell the same story—in too many cases urban renewal means "removal of low-income Negroes" and in too many instances this removal is accomplished without the benefit of assistance payments or advisory assistance in terms of finding decent, sanitary, alternative housing.

We also have reports from Dayton; Elizabeth, N.J.; South Bend, Ind.; Champaign, Ill.; Omaha, Nebr.; New Brunswick, N.J.; Flint, Mich.; and San Diego, Calif. All of these are having similar difficulties in working for the relocation of individuals displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs.

From the foregoing you can see that one of the most glaring problems relating to the various grants programs is that relocation policies are both inconsistent and inequitable. The common thread which runs throughout the reports we have received can be summed up in four statements:

1. There is an inadequate policy for making assistance payments and providing advisory assistance;
2. There is no positive, affirmative assistance in locating decent, safe, sanitary housing comparable to that being vacated by displaced persons, or more desirably, better than that being vacated by displaced persons;
3. In most cases, there is a lack of adequate notice before being forced to move; and
4. There tends to be an unwillingness of local officials to comply with the "spirit of the law" in providing assistance to the displaced.

Let me digress from the prepared statement and point out that in Pittsburgh, which is so proud of its Golden Triangle and its new arena, when there was the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh, a separate public corporation, which was the responsible agent for relocation at the beginning of the program of urban redevelopment and renewal—the Housing Authority at that time accepted this responsibility. It had an obligation to accept the individuals who were eligible for public housing, but, once that responsibility had been accepted we found many instances of early eviction of people who should have remained in housing authority projects but who were undesirable as far as the housing authority administration was concerned.

The letter of the law was "obey the spirit." These problems are not new.

Three years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations issued a report on "Relocation: Unequal treatment of people and businesses displaced by governments."