

something along this line, before we talk about increasing the lease lengths any further?

Secretary WEAVER. We would like to do a little bit of both, Congressman. We would like to have the 3 years, as you originally proposed, as the general regulation for the program. But in those instances where we have families which are displaced, and where the matter of security is tremendously important, where they have had to pay the cost for improvements that help the whole city and may not help them, we feel that some degree of longer tenure for them would be desirable. We are asking for this extension for this category only. It would not affect the total program, only those units where those displaced by public action are involved.

Mrs. MCGUIRE. May I add, Dr. Weaver, that this proposal, part of this has come from actual experience with housing authorities who have long waiting lists for large families and who are also faced with the relocation of families by public action. It is also based on the reactions of many authorities who don't want to be faced with a landlord finishing the lease in a 3-year period with relation to large displaced families.

Mr. WIDNALL. I appreciate the fact that you are really just started on this program, that it is being tested. I hope it proves itself in action.

Mr. Secretary, as first proposed by the President last year, I discovered in your statement before the committee during hearings held in 1965 that the rent supplement program was for people above the eligibility level in their respective communities; is that not right?

Secretary WEAVER. You mean the eligibility level for public housing?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is right.

Secretary WEAVER. Yes.

Mr. WIDNALL. And the Congress said, reduce this eligibility level for those who would have a rent supplement to the public housing level. Since that time you have issued revised administrative requirements with regard to rent supplements. As I understand the eligibility income requirements correctly, they are now the same as those of public housing with the exception of New York City, where rent supplement payments can only be made for tenants if their income is higher than that of public housing; is that not correct?

Secretary WEAVER. Well, yes and no. Let me say that we have not issued any regulations. We have set forth the rules of the game, which will be the basis for the regulations when they are issued. We will not issue regulations until after the program is funded.

We have proposed that the maximum income at time of admission for the rent supplement program cannot exceed those for public housing. In the case of New York City, because of the relatively high cost in that city, we have a cutoff point at a three-bedroom unit, whereas public housing goes up to a five- or six-bedroom unit. That is why the cutoff point for public housing is higher in New York City than would be true for rent supplements. We have not modified the public housing limits. But we have made a realistic adjustment to the cost factor which is involved in New York City.

Mr. WIDNALL. The public housing eligibility requirement for a family of five in New York City stands now at a maximum of \$7,476, to