Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Fino, back in the fifties and forties I remember testifying with our witnesses in support of the rent supplement idea as an alternative to public housing, so this wasn't a new policy position for our association.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Emlen, does this not warrant a tremendous commendation for the real estate boards when they have found they have made a mistake? Does it not show the bigness of the boards to come out and say, "We made a mistake, we realize it." Would it not be possible that while you oppose the demonstration cities program now, that ultimately you may come before the committee and say back in 1966 we made a mistake again and we are coming here today to clarify it. I would hope that it will happen. Thank you.

Mr. FINO. Again, we hope we might see you in the future coming back and saying, after this so-called experiment is tried that we realize the mistake that we made and we want to correct that mistake that we made on top of the mistake in the first instance.

Are you familiar with the rent ceilings on 221(d)(3)?

Mr. EMLEN. I will have to defer to Mr. Williamson.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes, on the 221(d)(3), the below-market rate program; yes, we are.

Mr. FINO. Do you feel that we should have rent supplements in the 221(d)(3)?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Absolutely not. That is why last year we opposed the rent supplement program as advocated by the administration because it was limited to the families whose incomes were within the eligibility ranges of the 221(d)(3), below market interest rate program. We argued that 92 percent of the American families in the $4,000 to $8,000 income brackets are adequately housed, that there is no justification for a subsidy for families in that income group. Any subsidy should be directed to those in the low-income groups and they are the ones who are within the eligibility range of public housing; and while there have been some abuses in certain areas we think by and large public housing has served the very low income families.

Mr. FINO. Do you think the rent supplements should be applicable or should be qualified for subsidized housing like in New York City where they have housing that is subsidized, low interest?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. You are referring to your release of yesterday, are you not, Mr. Fino? I think you mentioned that. Our position is that we are opposed to the double subsidy.

Mr. FINO. That is what it would amount to.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is why we like the rent supplement program, because that program does not have the hidden subsidies of public housing. It is fully taxable. It is financed in the private unsubsidized mortgage market. It is going in the front door so people will know exactly what it will cost to subsidize the poor.

Mr. BARRETT. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. Sullivan?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Emlen, I gather from your testimony that you are interested in the use of more Government funds for urban renewal to improve the grounds and the buildings and so forth—improvements in the community area generally. But you are not in favor of the Federal Gov-