

(a) The town of Ossining, N.Y., is the source of major complaint because a State highway program threatens to force approximately one-third of the Negro population to move. He says relocation housing is nonexistent. The town's Workable Program for Community Improvement expired in 1964. The housing authority is defunct and exists only on paper. If the program proceeds, these people must leave the town to locate other housing.

The second illustration is: in Dunkirk, N.Y., complaints are being received that families are forced to move because of building code violations in rental property. There is no relocation housing available. The city has an urban renewal program for the downtown area. There is no public housing available. The town wants to locate a project in the Negro neighborhood where overcrowding of the school has already resulted in busing of children. He is pressing for scattered site housing which Senator Baker indicated might be desirable and plans are at a standstill.

Last year we received a complaint from South Carolina indicating that a number of colored farmers were being forced to sell their land. Some of them were elderly and had no means to locate elsewhere. Upon investigation it turned out that the Government was expanding a wild bird sanctuary. Although this is a very fine project for preserving wildlife, it would seem that some arrangement could be worked out under which persons living in the area might be allowed to remain if they preferred to do so.

As I understand it, the Department of the Interior sometimes works out arrangements of this kind, but this possibility for being allowed to stay was not revealed to the persons who were being displaced.

In that connection also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record an exchange of correspondence on this matter which substantiates the fact that it was for a wildlife preserve and, in fact, this significant paragraph is in it:

Although the title to these lands is now vested in the United States, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is permitting the owners to farm the land during the 1967 crop year and the present occupants to remain on the land until they can make arrangements to relocate, but not beyond December 31, 1967.

That letter is dated February 17, 1967. I just cannot for the life of me see how it is going to hurt the birds to have some people live on the land after the Government improves it, and I cannot understand why in making these plans Interior or other agencies would not do as your bill suggests, take into consideration the effect it is going to have on humans who are in the area.

Senator MUSKIE. That correspondence will be included. Now, that date is in the past. Do you know what has happened?

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not, except that the date of cutoff has been reached and I assume that they are no longer there. I tried to get one of them on the phone this morning, or at least a person who knows about it on the phone this morning, and I was unable to reach him, so I could not get it up to date, as I did on the Montgomery situation.

Mr. MITCHELL. In reading the bill I have the impression that there is a need to make some of the safeguards mandatory and this is one reason why I suggest this: for example, I would change the word "should" in line 19 on page 52 to "shall."