

sidered, including the welfare of the people to be displaced, and that the public interest nonetheless requires the acquisition. There also should be a procedure for a speedy review of the decision by an outside agency not connected with the operation of the program.

Turning to the issue of relocation, itself, title VIII recognizes that the problem of relocating displaced families, most of whom are poor and a disproportionate number of whom are nonwhite, can be met only through assistance. The assistance provided in the bill would take several forms. First, financial assistance, which would be more substantial than any provided under the existing law. The bill recognizes, however, that adequate relocation requires more than money and it also would require Federal and State agencies to establish relocation assistance programs which would offer services aimed at assisting displaced families in securing decent housing.

Several of the key provisions regarding relocation assistance programs, contained in section 803(c), are derived from the existing urban renewal law. We believe these provisions are necessary if displaced families are to have a real opportunity to relocate in decent housing. On the basis of the experience under the urban renewal program, however, there is some doubt that relocation assistance programs, under existing conditions, can be completely successful.

First, there is a certain unreal quality about these provisions. One of the aims of a relocation assistance program would be "to assure that within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, there will be available * * * at rents or prices within the financial means of families and individuals displaced, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings * * *." This provision seems to assume that in most areas of the country there is a sufficient supply of lower income housing and that all that is needed is for the poor to be directed to it. This simply is not true, at least with respect to cities, where most displacement occurs. Housing provided through the ordinary channels of the housing market is too expensive for most displaced families. Government subsidy programs aimed at providing a sufficient supply of lower income housing, such as public housing, FHA 221(d)(3), and rent supplements, have produced only a comparative handful of units when measured against the enormous need, which is calculated at some 6 million units.

As the Civil Disorders Commission pointed out, the dimensions of the need for low- and moderate-income housing call for an unprecedented national effort, which would produce 6 million units over the next 5 years. The administration's proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 also recognizes the urgent need for the immediate production of a large volume of housing within the means of lower income families. In short, with the existing shortage of lower income housing there are severe limits to the effectiveness of any effort to assure satisfactory relocation of displaced families.

We are told, nonetheless, that the great majority of displaced families have relocated in what is considered to be standard housing. That statement, I think, was made earlier this morning.

In view of the acknowledged scarcity of lower income housing, the obvious question arises—where did these families go? To a large extent, the answer is—we don't know. Urban renewal, for example, which maintains the most comprehensive information on relocation,