

friend in the ranks of those who want to do something to help the low-income families obtain decent homes.

I certainly in some respects may disagree with your remarks about the pending legislation, but I can say without hesitation that you are right on the rent supplement program.

If you desire to read your testimony in full before we ask any questions you may do so, and if there is any other approach that you are desirous of taking, we will abide by whatever you think is best.

You may proceed.

Mr. EMLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Alan L. Emlen, a realtor engaged in the business of real-estate brokerage in Philadelphia. I appear here today as chairman of the Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Our association consists presently of 1,519 local boards of realtors with a membership of 82,547.

We propose to comment on provisions of three bills pending before the subcommittee. We are aware of other bills which have been introduced during the past several weeks and have been referred to this subcommittee. These latter bills are under study by our association and we will endeavor to file supplementary statements on them in the near future.

We will cover the three principal measures in the order of their introduction.

#### H.R. 12341, THE DEMONSTRATION CITIES ACT OF 1966

Briefly, the bill would provide a monetary inducement to a limited number of communities to plan more comprehensively and to demonstrate more effectively their desire to improve the quality of urban life.

The incentive takes the form of the Federal Government absorbing up to 80 percent of the normal State or local share of a vast number of Federal grant-in-aid programs to the extent that such grant-in-aid programs figure in the demonstration project. In addition, the Federal Government would provide 90 percent of the cost of planning and developing these comprehensive city demonstration programs.

The fundamental weakness in the bill is that it seeks solely by means of increased Federal grants to induce the cities to do that which they should have been doing in the years when they prevailed on the Federal Government to execute billions of dollars in binding contracts for urban renewal including urban planning, community renewal planning, and general neighborhood renewal planning.

The proposal would have some validity if the Congress had been remiss in the past in supplying funds for urban planning. With respect to the three such programs presently in existence, we note the absence of any critique of these programs in the Secretary's testimony on February 28 before this subcommittee. As of December 31, 1965, 2,286 urban planning projects have been approved involving \$99.9 million.

For more detailed planning the Congress has provided for financial assistance under community renewal programs and general neighborhood renewal planning. A total number of 146 CRP's have been ap-