living in acquired properties who for a variety of reasons are not eligible for nor are able to afford any type of decent housing.

So here we will have people going from one room to another room, and all kinds of problems. Estimates show that 10 to 15 percent of

city-wide dislocatees are too poor for public housing.

I would like to add, sir, this little paragraph from the Pierce Street Report: "The families from Pierce Street do not gain from urban renewal in their block, and yet it is they who have paid the price. Statistics alone cannot express the story of these people, the anxiety, the fear, the days spent in official run-arounds, the breaking up of families, displacement, and the helplessness that accompany this. These elements must be added to the cost. Does the community have a right to impose these burdens on those living in the paths of improvement for the greater public good? Does the price the poor pay for being so poor have to be so high?"

Senator Muskie. Thank you very much, Mrs. Jefferies. This is excellent testimony, and we are especially appreciative of your very specific and concrete recommendations. It is all too often that we get people who express concern about the problems, but do not help us to work out the specific details. Your experience on Pierce Street has been an invaluable source, and I think they are very practical and concrete suggestions.

Then you have additional statements or other statements that have

been prepared?

Mrs. Jefferies. Yes, these statements are some that we though would be helpful. They include the Pierce Street Report, issued in August, 1966 our proposal for interim housing in Northwest, and a proposal for school site selection. We have taken or have a policy here on school site selections which we thought would be of interest.

Senator Muskie. These will all be included in the record.

Mrs. Jefferies. Thank you very much.

(The materials referred to will be included in the appendix of thes

hearings.)

Senator Muskie. There have been several other suggestions offered in the course of the hearings, and I might pose a few of them to the both of you to get your reactions. I could anticipate some of your answers but we might just as well put them.

One is that we ought to require that the housing where the dis placed will be relocated be available before approval of renewal pro grams so that the renewal areas remain habitable to families that ar

relocated. I assume that you both approve of this?

Mr. Freeland. Yes.

Senator Muskie. It is implicit in some of Mrs. Jefferies suggestions Mrs. Jefferies. This, also, we have discussed in the proposal for th school site selection. We have one school site where the families wer moved out, and on this very site they have moved in families from fiv other school sites at the same time they were trying to get the familie out. The community feels strongly that homes should be built befor they demolish homes for another school site, and also the same fo urban renewal. We feel that there should be a home for a home.

The relocation plan to me, has been very lackadasical sort of thin and they cannot produce the relocation homes that they say they hav

available in the city.