

every big city is that when Negroes move into housing which is available, which has formerly been all white, there is an increase in rent. Now, in other words, I am suggesting that until the public and private practices which restrict housing supply available to nonwhites in America are ceased with the aid of legislation presently on the books, with the aid of enforcement of that legislation at every level, there will be no resolution of the problem.

Secondly, and more importantly, though I recognize the eyesore, and I even remember the first Supreme Court decision when eyesores become a factor in the right of a municipality to exercise eminent domain, these eyesores will be with us forever unless we have good planning, and I would say let us have the eyesores, but decent housing, and if it means fewer urban renewal projects, we just have fewer urban renewal projects. The country must make a choice. If it means more money for planning and developing housing before the other housing is torn down, that money must be made available or we must recognize that we have failed in one of the most important areas of the American way of life. I think the decision, at least the points about which the decision can be made, are pretty clear. There must be free access to the housing market by Negroes, and too, Government must decide whether the eyesores, the esthetic problems, are more important than the human problems of decent, sanitary, and safe housing for people.

Senator MUSKIE. Now, what you two have said, in effect, suggests that the humane relocation policy cannot be developed unless it is accompanied by an expanded housing program.

Mr. FREELAND. Correct.

Senator MUSKIE. You have made another point that had not occurred to me before. You say that as housing is destroyed to make way for urban renewal and highway projects, that it has the effect of shrinking the housing market and thus aiding or creating an upward pressure on rent. To what extent is this the case?

Mr. FREELAND. I think that it can be supported in every major community in America. In Pittsburgh, for instance, just as an example, there was an old furniture warehouse, No. 1 Miller Street, and when relocation efforts were made in order for us to have a new civic arena with a retractable roof that never seems to work—we got it—and three blocks away there is No. 1 Miller Street, and this old furniture warehouse became a dwelling unit for about “5 million”—it seemed “5 million” people.

I mean, I do not know how many people were in that building. They had little closets that became rooms, and the social services that were rendered to the people in there were fantastic, and, of course, in larger cities this is duplicated on even a greater scale, but this is just one example, and the rent was whatever the market would bring, as Mrs. Jefferies has pointed out.

The poor people, black people in America, do pay more of their income, percentagewise, for housing. This is the color tax, and I am certain, as I said, though I have no specific statistics, but these could be made available from our national office, and I know in the data before the Kerner Commission you would find the rate of increase for the displaced person in his new setting, and I think the rate of increase is substantial and it is prohibitive when you consider the actual income of the persons usually there.