

Mr. HARVEY. It is your answer that overbuilding does not enter into the problem, or do you feel it does enter into it?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I don't believe—

Mr. HARVEY. Is this amendment here—is this—

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The amendment that would shift rent certificates to new construction? The purpose of that amendment is to permit the local housing authority to go to a builder who is going to build 100 single-family homes in a development and execute an agreement leasing, maybe, for 30 years, 20 of the units and use them for low-income families with a rent supplement paid by the local housing authority to the owner.

Mr. HARVEY. That gets to the next question. You feel apparently, and I share some of the same qualms, frankly, that a 40-year position is too long and yet Secretary Weaver has indicated that he feels that a 3-year limit is too short to encourage builders. Is there a happy medium for expanding the rent certificate program that you would feel satisfied with?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If you are going to redirect the rent certificate program to the leasing of new construction, then I agree, that is not too long, because no builder is going to build with a commitment for only a 3-year lease. But I think the whole idea—

Mr. HARVEY. On the other hand if he had not built or not rented he might consider 3 or 5.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I didn't get that.

Mr. HARVEY. If he has the apartment built and substantially vacant he might well consider less.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The normal lease is a 1-year lease that many owners of existing rental units would be very glad to obtain.

Mr. HARVEY. Would you be in favor of giving the Department a greater, longer period of time than 3 years or something less than 40?

Mr. EMLIN. Our position is that we are afraid that if new construction gets into this we are going to destroy something that is just beginning to prove itself. To get back to my own area, we have a very large supply of good existing units to be used in this program and if the emphasis gets away from existing structures, we are going to waste an awful lot of good shelter and it would be a shame because the thing is just beginning to take hold and some of the real estate men and other owners are just beginning to find out about it and it would be a shame to stop it at this point.

Mr. HARVEY. Shifting your attention to H.R. 12946. I ask you this. What do you do with communities where all efforts at annexation have been thwarted? Where you have communities? Where nothing else can be done to encourage the metropolitan planning since all efforts at the State level and local level that bring this about have failed? There is not much left other than to somehow encourage the new development of the metropolitan planning by grants. Do you have any other suggestion?

Mr. EMLIN. I would like to ask Mr. Stewart to speak on that.

Mr. STEWART. I think it is very clear that political unity of a greater metropolitan area is not acceptable. I believe the one example we have in all the United States is Dade County which is a rather mild form of it. What can happen, and what needs to happen is not so much the acquisition of funds for planning as willingness on the part