

to defend the voting integrity of 33,878 of our citizens. I have documents to prove that this is so.

I have just received a copy of the annual report of the Downtown Denver Improvement Association. I would like to quote from page 4 of their report. May I give you a very brief outline of the events that lead to this moment: I was elected by the people of my district to serve a 4-year term on the Denver City Council beginning July 1, 1963. I hold that position today.

When exposed to the urban renewal process and the granting to appointed boards or commissions the power of eminent domain, my spirit rebelled within me. I had been taught that this was a power granted to the State (used in its broad sense) and that it was to be used, according to our Constitution, to obtain private, personal property only for public use and that with just compensation therefor. When it was that I learned that by interpretation this phrase "public use" also meant "public good," I was sickened even further. In my judgment, this is the most warped interpretation of our Constitution that I have ever heard. For government to deprive an individual of his property for sale to another is unthinkable, regardless of the end to be achieved.

Up to this time, Denver had four urban renewal projects approved; namely, Avondale, Blake, Whittier, and Jerome. I have no argument with this. They were accomplished by prior city council action and if proper methods are used, they should be completed. However, we are confronted today with further urban renewal proposals which I suggest are contrary to the wishes of the people of Denver.

In June of 1964, in order to obtain financing for several worthwhile projects in Denver, the administration, with the consent of the city council, placed before the voters of Denver 10 proposals to be financed by general obligation bonds. Of these 10 (I have the record with me) 4 failed to pass. It is important to note what these four rejected items were: (1) new city hall, \$3 million; (2) new city shops, \$2 million; (3) hall of justice complex, \$7.8 million; and (4) urban renewal, \$8 million. (The urban renewal proposal was for the controversial skyline project plus five other projects.) According to the mayor's own statement: "Voters must be given the opportunity, under law, to accept or reject each individual capital improvement." (I have the printed statement with me.) I would call to your attention that in every case the language for each of the 10 bond proposals were exactly the same and should be interpreted on the same basis.

I contend that as a result of this rejection by the voters of Denver that there should not have been any further new urban renewal projects contemplated in Denver, unless and until they be approved by the electorate. I have a short speech that I made to the Denver City Council on this subject and would like to read it and make it a part of this record.

Gentlemen, there appears before you today the mayor of our city and three members of the Denver Urban Renewal Authority. The mayor and these men he has brought with him, appointed by him, seek to continue those projects which the voters of Denver rejected plus other projects which have been added since 1964.

These gentlemen from Denver come before you armed with personal prestige and power. I stand before you as David of old, armed with a sling and one stone, the vote of the people.

Much has been said in the Congress in 1965 regarding the undesirable precedent of including public facilities, such as convention centers, in urban renewal projects. In the case of Denver, I contend that extending the boundaries of the proposed skyline project to include our convention center and other areas that are definitely not "slum or blighted" is a fraud upon the people of Denver. As you know, Denver suffered a serious flood in 1965 and it was argued that because of this, funds set aside for urban renewal would have to be used for flood relief. Gentlemen, not 1 cent has ever been appropriated by the Denver City Council for the skyline project. All, I say all of the moneys used thus far for the proposed skyline project are Federal funds with the explicit understanding that Denver would be under no obligation to approve the project.

Gentlemen, I plead with you, to grant no more funds for urban renewal projects in Denver. That in order to do so you would require that a favorable vote of the people of Denver be obtained for any and all projects contemplated, including the proposed skyline project, prior to any commitment of Federal funds.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today. I have data with me and would be happy to try and answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.