

The 1954 Housing Act placed emphasis on rehabilitation for this reason, and later amendments have moved further in this direction. Even neighborhood conservation and rehabilitation, however, displaces many families. Code enforcement eliminates overcrowding or perhaps requires outright condemnation of some dwellings, forcing families out. It also forces an increase in rents to pay for required repairs and rehabilitation, again tending to cause displacement.

A second characteristic of the housing problem of families displaced by urban renewal and other Government action, distinguishing them from others contending with a limited housing supply, is the matter of timing. Displaced against their will, they cannot wait until the housing market suits them. Also, they must compete with others in the same position, such as other displacees of urban renewal and other governmental programs, new migrants to the city, and new families.

NEGROES, LARGE FAMILIES, AND THE ELDERLY

Especially hard hit by displacement due to urban renewal are nonwhite families, large families, and the elderly. Rehousing these groups was high on the list of "problems" reported by cities responding to the ACIR-CM survey, particularly the rehousing of large, low-income families. Dayton, Des Moines, Honolulu, New Haven, Norfolk, Oakland, Rochester, and Tampa were among cities making special note of these problems.

The most critical conditions confront Negroes, who represent a disproportionate part of the population occupying urban areas under renewal. Of the total number of families displaced by urban renewal in the 15 years ending on September 30, 1963, 63 percent of those for whom color was reported were nonwhite.

Nonwhites are disadvantaged in terms of education, income, employment, housing, and other social and economic characteristics. Their status is reflected in the fact that through September 30, 1963, 56 percent of displaced nonwhites were eligible for low-rent public housing, compared to 38 percent of whites. Moreover, even those who do have income enabling them to afford standard private housing often face obstacles of discriminatory real estate financing and zoning practices which reduce the supply of housing available to them. They find a shortage of land available to build on as well as a shortage of existing housing available to purchase or rent.¹⁸ Those above the income level necessary to qualify for low-rent public housing find it more difficult to borrow than do white families of similar economic status. As a consequence, where urban renewal has been undertaken with too little regard for the problem of displacement, it has been disparaged with the name "Negro removal." Nonwhites have been forced into already crowded housing facilities, thereby spreading blight, aggravating patterns of racial segregation, and generally defeating the social purposes of urban renewal.¹⁹

¹⁸ In commenting on "Principal Problems" in the ACIR-CM survey, Allentown, Pa., said: "Need for more freedom of movement for minority families."

¹⁹ See annual reports of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1959, 1961, and 1963 (Washington: Government Printing Office); Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Family Relocation Under Urban Renewal in Connecticut* (Washington: Government Printing Office, July 1963); and Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Discrimination in Housing in the Boston Metropolitan Area* (Washington: Government Printing Office, December 1963).