

strings to it so that it is not misused, while leaving it open for further explanation in the report, to indicate that in the event another low-income family did not buy it, it could be sold at the going interest rate.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mrs. Sullivan, I think we are in full accord—it is just the mechanics. I think you should be commended.

I have been dealing with low-income families for many years and if you give them hope, and give them an opportunity down the line, it is amazing how some of them will struggle to become home owners. We even encouraged, if you will remember, in the rent supplement program, that these people who were receiving supplements would also be able to, at such time as they could qualify, purchase their home—there are many—there are any number of ways that this could work, either in a condominium or single family. You could take a condominium apartment in which these units would be sold off and it is commendable to try to get these low-income families to own their own homes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Blackmon, the examples of what is being done already and the proposals being made by this nonprofit group at home are really the most exciting thing that I have ever seen for a rehabilitation program.

Their belief is, as you have mentioned in your statement, that it is time now to give people a chance to own something. We recognize now that you just cannot rehabilitate only the house. You must rehabilitate the family also, and encourage them to use every self-help program. The nonprofit group in St. Louis has so far rehabilitated some 41 houses with private funds and have sold them to low-income families which could not possibly have bought homes under any other circumstances.

This is a technique for rebuilding the whole family. When Johnny begins to saw on the door or begins to abuse the plumbing, papa will stop it right away because he says, "This belongs to us, Johnny. Do not destroy your own property." I think it teaches responsibility and sound values. They can buy these reconditioned houses and eventually own them, rather than having the occupants subsidized in rent either through the rent supplement or some other program, as tenants who have no personal stake in the property.

I am very happy that you feel this merits passage.

Mr. BLACKMON. It is very worthwhile.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Blackmon, I have just two very short questions.

I notice on page 6 you indicate that the name of the coordinator could be changed to a demonstration coordinator or an urban program coordinator. What I would like to get from you, if you would tell us what you think of it being optional or mandatory?

Mr. BLACKMON. I would feel that it should probably be optional. I contend that the Federal coordinator could be called anything other than a Federal coordinator. Really, what he is doing is coordinating the program within the community—whether he be called a demonstration coordinator—this gives him more of a title as to what he really is and the Federal aspect has a tendency, especially in some parts of the country, to imply other things that are not desirable, in my way of thinking. And I have had people express themselves to me along these lines.

Mr. BARRETT. You would leave that flexible, I assume?