

Mr. CAVANAGH. In response to your question, Congressman Gonzalez, I would say very emphatically, yes, public housing is a most essential, most vital tool in the recharacterization of our cities large and small. Last year in my appearance before this committee in relation to the Housing and Urbanization Act of 1965 I understood this committee and the Congress to increase the number of authorized public housing units. We have under construction at the present time, I think, about 1,500 new public housing units principally to be used by senior citizens at scattered sites throughout the community, and we need far more. I think there are some new concepts in public housing that have to be adopted by these cities. The idea of the old institutionalized or ghettoized type of public housing, I don't think is a very viable tool in the arsenal which we are supposed to use. If we use public housing in a rather imaginative sort of way and spread it throughout the neighborhoods and make it architecturally designed to complement the neighborhood, then I think it is a most important tool, and I agree with you that it should be emphasized.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am quite a bit concerned, because I believe a tendency has set in which amounts to a shuttling to one side of public housing, and last year I think we contemplated what I consider an imaginative approach of going into private dwelling through public housing criteria. I was just wondering if this new program would not actually mean the demise of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to Mr. St Germain if he has any more questions he would like to ask.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Thank you, Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Mayor—

Mr. BARRETT. May I inform the gentleman that you have a minute and a half.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mayor, among the stated objectives in the act, on the one hand we have a suggestion that new concepts of architecture will be utilized, and also that the type of construction of materials utilized would be of such a nature as to reduce costs. And yet on the other hand, they say, nevertheless we wish to preserve the old architecture, the historical aspect, and what have you. And I wonder if you have given any thought to this, and whether or not you have come to a decision on it, conclusion as to whether this can be done, to these which are in my mind are in juxtaposition. And I am wondering what your opinion is on this matter.

Mr. CAVANAGH. I think that it can be done. We have attempted in our city through the historical commission and the historical society, working with the local American Institute of Architects chapter, plus our city planning commission, to identify every building in the community that had any architectural or historical significance, and put it on a sort of an exempt list, except from redevelopment, or the bulldozer, and hopefully develop some rehabilitation in relations to some of these buildings. There is an interesting book that has just been published coming out sponsored by, under the auspices of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, called "The Heritage So Rich." There are a few pictures in it that I disagree with. But it is a most interesting book. They show our old city hall as having some great architectural beauty, which it had not. But other than that, the book is most