

keeps it only with respect to families who have entered the relocation agency's caseload. The responsibility of the local public agency for relocation commences at the time the loan and grant contract with HUD is executed. Many families, however, move out prior to that time because of the impending clearance. These families are not part of the relocation caseload, nor are they included in the data concerning relocation. Further, there is no obligation on the part of the Federal Government or the local public agency to provide any assistance to these families. Whether they departed before or after the urban renewal loan grant contract was executed it is clear that their displacement was a result of urban renewal. No information is available, however, on how these families fared after displacement.

It is clear also that most of the families who did relocate in standard housing managed it without assistance from the local public agency. In the 1964 census study of urban renewal relocation, it was pointed out that although 90 percent of the families surveyed received counseling, financial, or other assistance from the local public agency during the relocation process, 70 percent of the families relocated through their own efforts, without assistance from the local public agency. Thus, on the basis of the urban renewal experience, there is reason to question the effectiveness of relocation assistance programs, such as those provided in the bill.

Further, many of the families managed it by stretching their limited resources to pay rent. According to the census study, the median rent that relocated families had to pay was 28 percent of their income. For nonwhites, it was even higher. About three of ten non-white families had to pay between 35 and 64 percent of their income for rent.

Beyond this, however, there is some question whether all the families reported to have relocated in standard housing actually did so, at least in the sense that most of us view the term standard housing. The technical definition of standard housing deals primarily with plumbing. Thus a housing unit which is clearly in deteriorating condition is considered standard according to the technical definition so long as it has adequate plumbing facilities.

In a long and, I think, useful piece in the New York Times yesterday, it was stated that there are 800,000 units of substandard housing in the city of New York. This is a staggering figure, obviously not based completely on plumbing.

Moreover, housing that is occupied by more families than it is designed to hold is not thereby rendered substandard. On the basis of the Commission's experience, overcrowding is a major problem resulting from urban renewal displacement. For example, at the Commission's hearing in Cleveland, Ohio, we heard testimony that urban renewal had had the effect of moving Negroes from one slum neighborhood into the Hough area, causing the Hough area to become overcrowded and leading to the deterioration of other areas of the city. As one Commission witness put it:

You are just moving your ghetto from Hough to Glenville, to Mount Pleasant, and finally to Lee-Harvard and Shaker Heights and God knows where to from there.

This process is continuing. I saw a recent article which indicated that the vacancy rate in Hough was increasing while other areas were becoming more overcrowded.