

keep trying and keep incorporating rehabilitation in many of these projects.

Mr. WIDNALL. Do I understand you to say that it has been encouraged by Washington but discouraged by the FHA Administrator?

Mr. CANDEUB. This has been our experience.

Mr. WIDNALL. You point up the danger of having a demonstration cities program confined to 70 cities—the danger that if confined to 70 cities, it might have on future urban renewal projects. Could you elaborate on that?

Mr. CANDEUB. There are many areas in cities, large cities, such as, for instance, Akron, Ohio, or Hamilton, Ohio, cities that I mentioned, where we have helped develop the community renewal programs, where you have very extensive areas—very large areas relative to the size of the city, that are blighted and these areas are on the downgrade, they have many problems—families of low income, families with psychological problems and social problems. In many cases, the cities don't care to tackle these areas on any large scale because they cannot cope with all of the problems to be found in these neighborhoods.

The demonstration program, seemingly, is oriented to providing an instrument to tackle this type of neighborhood—to tackle, in a sense, not just physical blight, the idea of clearing buildings to provide land—but attack the whole range of social problems to give homes to people who are living in areas that are not desirable.

It is my feeling that if we pass this act and then we say so many cities may come in under it, and then the doors are closed, that we are discouraging—effectively discouraging—so many other cities where there are organizations, where there are well-minded mayors, councils, elected officials, who have looked for this kind of program for many years and who have found that it is impossible to move through the instrument of limited renewal funds on this type of area.

Are we in effect saying that by some arbitrary designation so many cities may come in and, regardless of what other cities may do, they may not come in on this type of program? I simply don't think that is proper.

I think this would, in effect, set us back to some degree.

Mr. WIDNALL. How much do you estimate would be necessary to do the job correctly?

Mr. CANDEUB. Congressman, I don't know—I wouldn't want to even begin to make such an estimate, and I am not sure, frankly, whether anyone is really in a position to make this estimate.

What I am suggesting is that we introduce the ability to start to cope with these programs as this act does, by providing for initial planning funds and with powers to deal with large areas in a given community and allow for a period of experimentation and planning. Perhaps out of this experience, further determinations can be made as to how fast we can pace ourselves as a nation to accomplish a total program. I don't think that this can be accomplished in a 20-year period. It is my feeling that we have to think in terms of a 30-year to a 40-year period. I feel that the rate at which we can move in a given community, the effective rate at which we can move in terms of rehabilitation, in terms of social action, in terms of education, even without regard to money, is limited.