

clearance project were to be part of the demonstration city program in Detroit, it would appear that the existing backlog would require us to wait over a year before the grant commitment would be received so that the project could begin. Similarly, if we were to require a grant for a neighborhood facility, there is not enough money in the authorization or the appropriation to be able to count on getting approval. The same sort of thing could happen in a number of Federal programs. And if we did receive the funds which had been allocated—or if the funds were to be diverted away from cities which had their urban renewal application in before the demonstration city concept was presented—there would be, justifiably, hard feelings on the part of the cities around America. And to turn the coin to the other side, I am sure Detroit would take umbrage at having some other city get its share of urban renewal funds if it were designated and Detroit was not selected, which I would hate to contemplate, Mr. Chairman.

So there is a need then, for a number of steps. First, it seems the full amount of \$2.9 billion title I funds authorized by the Congress for urban renewal should be released instead of being programed over 4 years. I know there may be some objection to this form of financing; however, the demand is there and the very nature of the urban renewal process requires the release of these funds.

Second, it seems there should be a general look at the relationship of the financing of the demonstration cities program and other Federal programs to assure there is no draining of funds from existing programs. The moneys required for demonstration city should supplement those programs which are underfinanced now either due to inadequacy of funding or because of established priorities. The demonstration city program will call for immediate allocations from a number of Federal programs. It will not broach delay. But not only should there be 80 percent funding of the local share of Federal programs which can be committed to the demonstration program, as provided in the act, but there should also be 90-percent funding of the total cost for all other portions of the approved demonstration program for which Federal funds are not presently available. This would cover the total local program and include funds for those components which may not have a Federal program source but which are important to the success of the project.

To summarize this section: I don't think the Federal programs should not be diverted from their legislative objectives. Dilution's a real possibility, and diversion could create ill will. Urban renewal funds should be made available now to eliminate the backlog. Demonstration city program funds should be available to take up the slack where regular Federal program funds are not available. Demonstration city program funds should also be used for the non-Federal components which are needed for a comprehensive local program.

Third, it seems that not only is there a need to create a demonstration city program open on a first-come, first-served basis and with adequate funding for the full range of Federal programs to be employed in the target areas, but there is also a range—a need to provide proper funding for the demonstration cities' legislation itself.

These suggestion I have just made about 90 percent funding of the demonstration program components to avoid diluting existing Fed-