

Mayor Locher, in 1963, when you appeared before this committee, you cited three projects in the city and then said, and I quote from your testimony:

From 1953 to 1959, Cleveland has sufficiently stemmed the spread of further blight by financial assistance from the Federal Government under title I and rehabilitation programs, and by 1959 the housing supply will increase to the point of maximum need; that the city of Cleveland could turn its community attention to a central business district.

Early in 1964, when I detailed in the Congressional Record the sorry story of the East Woodland project, changed from residential commercial renewal, after eliminating the business in one of the areas, and encouraging the homeowners to put as much as \$6,800 apiece into rehabilitating their property, your director of urban renewal wrote Commissioner Slayton saying:

There is now an ever-increasing supply of housing available at almost any rental level.

Now, you are in here plugging for a program that is basically residential renewal oriented.

Quoting from the headlines of March 2 and 3, 1966, Cleveland Press, it reads: "Circle, Hough Area Renewal Failing" and "Our Lagging Slum Clearance." Would you say this might be the reason you need more help?

Mr. LOCHER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I don't believe that any older city in the United States has enough moderate- and low-income housing—particularly when I have tried to point out here that the people whom we thought of as the middle economic class are in ever-increasing numbers leaving the central city, and in their stead are coming in in-migrants and immigrants from all over the country and all over the world, who make it necessary that we have this great increase in coordination of educational and welfare services and all the other facilities. So that I don't believe we are ever at that very fortunate point where we have sufficient good housing of that nature.

Now, as you related, when I testified before this committee 2 years ago, in 1964, I pointed out that we were devoting a greater attention to Erie View, or the downtown urban renewal program. But that does not mean at all that we lost interest or sight of the other urban renewal areas.

As a matter of fact, the area that we call Longwood is now fortunately over 90 percent occupied, and it has a good working relationship, and the same is true at Garden Valley—that is in excess of 90 percent occupied.

So that we have not given all our attention to the downtown. We try to make it a balanced program. And it seems to me that that is what this bill calls for, a balanced sort of thing, where you begin with the schools themselves, and with Headstart, indeed, and then try to extirpate the evils that cause slum and blight. And perhaps through this demonstration we will be able to find the cure. I hope that we can. And I would hope that this committee would feel so.

Mr. WIDNALL. Has the Federal Urban Renewal Administration ever, in the past 3 years, held up or refused to recertify your city's workable program?

Mr. LOCHER. Mr. Chairman—no, I don't believe it has. As a matter of fact, our last one was just recertified about 3 weeks ago.