

With the great stress on cleaning up waterways, it is difficult to see why any agency of the Federal Government would assist in making the Chesapeake Bay a part of a sewage disposal system but apparently this is what happened. The experts also decided that it would not be a health hazard to beaches. I was unable to make a copy of this, Mr. Chairman, but I would appreciate, with the committee's permission to offer for inclusion in the record, wherever you think it is appropriate, a release dated March 9, 1967, from the Department of the Interior, stressing the importance of cleaning up estuarine waters, and of course the Chesapeake Bay is a body of water with salt and fresh water.

As one of the things as a hazard in the area, they want especially to avoid pollution of coastal areas by dumping in these kinds of things.

Senator MUSKIE. That will be inserted in the record.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

The fifth point is, there is a great need for coordination of programs in order that those who are supposed to benefit from them get the maximum possible service. A few nights ago I visited a very excellent home for elderly persons. It was built with Federal aid. At a late hour one of the residents decided she would take her dog for a walk.

As I observed the neighborhood, it offered a potential hazard even to a physically fit young individual but there were no policemen in sight. It would seem to me that when such projects are built, there should be some kind of planning that will insure adequate security. This could be done by agreements with the local police forces or making additional funds available for the training and hiring of individuals who would give adequate protection to person and property in such cases.

There must also be some assurance that the nonconforming uses which cause neighborhoods to deteriorate do not come back in after rehabilitation.

When former Senator Douglas conducted hearings in Baltimore, one witness testified as follows:

I served on a municipally appointed committee to study the correlation of the excessive number of liquor outlets in the center city with residential blight, slums, and deterioration of residential neighborhoods. We spent over a year making a study for the benefit of the Mayor, the Liquor Board, and the Urban Renewal Agency. We found a high correlation between the number of liquor outlets and residential blight.

In Harlem Park, our committee found not only an excessive number of liquor outlets, but an oversaturation. There were 36 taverns and liquor outlets in 32 residential blocks. Now, this seems to me that that is just a little bit too much public convenience, when you can get a drink at every block, and maybe you get too many.

Further, we found that most of these liquor outlets were nonconforming commercial uses on the first floor of residential buildings.

Recently, the same witness developed information showing that land cleared for redevelopment was also being used to bring in businesses that did not belong in residential areas. In one case, a home for the elderly is being built under the auspices of a church and a fraternal order. At the same time, an adjoining parcel of land is to be used for a night club.

We must develop some Federal standards which will be safeguards against local planning which defeats the broad purposes of redevelopment and renewal. Although I strongly favor local level