

highway program, by facilitating travel between cities and within metropolitan areas, has contributed significantly to transforming us into a mobile society. It also has been a major factor in the flight to the suburbs of the white middle class, transforming central cities into areas where the poor and the nonwhite increasingly predominate. Urban renewal, by contrast, is concerned with revitalizing our cities, in part, by attracting the very people that the highway program has enabled to leave.

Despite the inconsistencies in purpose and effect among various public improvement programs, they have a number of elements in common. Most involve massive displacement and a net reduction in the number of housing units. For example, urban renewal, through the end of 1965, had demolished more than 333,000 homes. During the same period, it had replaced them with only 84,000 dwelling units—approximately one-fourth the number the program had eliminated from the Nation's housing inventory. In 1967, alone, the Federal highway program eliminated more than 30,000 dwelling units. By the very nature of the program, it replaced none of them.

In addition, these programs tend to be highly selective with respect to the families they displaced. They have their principal impact on the poor. According to the Secretary of Transportation, during the 18-month period between April 1965, and October 1966, more than one-third of the families displaced by the highway program lived in homes valued at less than \$6,000 or which rented for less than \$60 a month. Fewer than 20 percent of the families displaced resided in homes valued at more than \$15,000 or which rented for more than \$110 a month. According to a census study of urban renewal relocation during the summer of 1964, 80 percent of the families displaced had incomes of less than \$6,000. Two of every five such families earned less than \$3,000 a year.

These programs have at least one further element in common. They displace a disproportionate number of nonwhites and other minority group families. In Baltimore, Md., almost nine of every 10 families displaced by public action during the decade of 1955 through 1964 were nonwhite. In Nashville, Tenn., the case discussed earlier, more than half the housing units occupied by Negroes were demolished through similar action during the present decade. The Federal highway program, alone, threatens to wipe out all of the 234 Negro businesses in North Nashville, which are reported to represent almost 90 percent of the Negro-owned and operated businesses in Davidson County. For urban renewal, of the displaced families whose color is known, nonwhites represent fully 60 percent since the program's inception.

Thus the impact of these programs falls with special severity on the poor—particularly the nonwhite poor—those who are least able to protect their vital interests, those whose range of relocation choice, by virtue of their race and their economic position, necessarily is the narrowest. These programs have been more of a threat than a hope to the urban poor. Highways have meant elimination of their homes and businesses on a massive scale. Urban renewal has meant, as charged Negro removal.

What I am suggesting is that Federal intervention to protect the interests of these families, restricted to the relocation stage of the