

they want their police force to behave and what kind of police force they want, and schools, housing, and so on.

I feel that they are worth saving, and I hope we can do it that way.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. In the city of Detroit they leveled about 3 square miles, I believe, at one point. They did not sell it and they did not rebuild for 2 or 3 years. As far as I know, every small business around that 3 square miles went broke.

I had a letter from some man in Chicago who pointed out that when it had begun, he had a net worth of \$250,000. Five years later he was living on social security. He had nothing, absolutely nothing. So that this, you are further destroying the tax base. You do not just destroy the tax base right there briefly, but you destroy the tax base all around it for a while.

Now, I might say that there is only one good view in the city of Detroit, and that is the river and Windsor. Yet it is very hard to rent high-rise apartments. One beautiful high-rise apartment, long balconies, is not renting at all. They are having a very difficult time renting it because it is too easy for people in Detroit to move out.

So the expressways out of town, and we have lots of them, also increase the problem of modernizing the city, do they not? Maybe you ought to decide on what you are going to do—have expressways or rebuild, or just exactly what are you going to do? Why not just let them go?

Mr. FITCH. May I comment?

First, with respect to the general question: Are the central cities worth saving—I would argue that in large part, this is going to be resolved by the market itself—whether the businessmen and tenants think the central city is worth living in. I think, the other part is the question of what are the alternatives.

Suppose you did not save the central cities? You would have a bunch of urban slag heaps, so to speak, representing the decaying civilization; I do not think this is an acceptable prospect for an increasingly affluent society.

I would argue, too, that the problems you see, Madam Chairman, reflect so far our fumbling approaches to urban renewal. I can think of a lot of high priority things to do in New York City. When I go up into the slum areas and see that the kids have no recreational facilities, I can think that it might be better to build recreation facilities for the people in that part of town, than to build expressways to get people out of town for weekend recreation. When I see the tremendous housing needs, I can think that it would be well to devote a good deal of money to putting up decent housing. I do not think this is impossible. I would suggest that the cost is trivial over the next 30 years compared with the total amount of resources which will be available.

You could have a very high standard of housing for about \$2 trillion out of the \$50 trillion which we may look forward to having.

So the costs which worry us when you analyze them are costs of urban infrastructure, public facilities, housing. When you look into what it would actually cost with respect to our potential resources, research, turns out to be relatively small. I think if we could work out some kind of program and plans which did not have to be achieved overnight, we could have tremendous improvement.