

Senator MUSKIE. The impression I get from your description of relocation programs in the city is that it is a sort of hit or miss thing, that it may or may not produce results?

Mrs. JEFFERIES. Right, and if you are a relocatee eligible for public housing, there seems to be a good chance that when a unit is available, you will get one if you are eligible. If you are not eligible for public housing then your chances are pretty slim.

Senator MUSKIE. What happens to the people whose income is too low to make them eligible for public housing? What do they do?

Mrs. JEFFERIES. Well, they try to—we have tried to help them, as we mentioned, get part time jobs or something, which is not always the case. They usually end up in a room, in with relatives, this type of thing, and sometimes they move into substandard homes that they cannot afford to pay for. These families or individuals cannot even afford the \$12 or \$15 a week for a room.

Public housing would be much cheaper——

Senator MUSKIE. The net effect is the overcrowding of existing housing, unless plans are made for additional development?

Mrs. JEFFERIES. That is very true.

Senator MUSKIE. Would you concur in that?

Mr. FREELAND. I do. In fact, if you look at the statistics of relocation, you will find that many people are relocated two or three times out of slum area No. 1 into an area which becomes slum area No. 2 and then into area No. 3. This is one of the reasons, I suppose, that some of the statistics are so alarming, because we are talking about the same individual, the same family several different times.

Senator MUSKIE. If we were to require the condition of Federal funding that the housing problem of all people displaced be solved before the project moves forward, how adequate would our funding of urban renewal and highway programs at the present time be? Do you have any estimate on that? I assume that this would slow down these programs.

Mr. FREELAND. It would. But one of the problems at the local level, of course, is that as soon as the Federal Government says there is money available the agencies rush to get it, and I think that this "hit-and-miss" proposition has been going on for too long, not just in relocation and housing problems, but in many other areas of Government activities, and I think that the primary responsibility in the housing should be the use of some of these dollars and cents, and also some of these dollars and cents available from private sectors for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for those people who are to be displaced. Symbols are important to people, and the builder is a symbol of destruction, and if there is no symbol of construction, the lack of confidence in a Government and society just increases and is one of the root causes, in my opinion, of much of the disturbances in many of the core cities of America.

In my own community in Pittsburgh, an area which had been planned to death literally (of course, all of the plans are no longer in the books today), the people said no more bulldozers, and I honestly believe that the people of that community in the city of Pittsburgh will stand in front of a bulldozer until they find homes for the people who may be displaced.