

advice which could be forwarded to all local governments and local civic leaders so that they could get on with the job of solving urban problems.

Trimming this proposal back to just a few cities might be workable. But at this time there is no incentive provided in the bill to do anything except to proceed into a similar demonstration.

In other words, what the selected cities—we have heard numbers from 10 or 12, to 60 or 70—would demonstrate is that with about 93 or 95 percent subsidies they can get certain action.

What does this demonstrate to other cities? It only demonstrates that they could possibly get similar action with similar treatment. It is an incentive to stand in line for subsidies. This standing in line may take a long time. I would have to say for the national chamber we would want to consider such a proposal as a revised bill.

Mr. FINO. As I understand it, it is your feeling that if this bill is enacted, Congress should spell out as much as possible, more definitely what can and cannot be done under its provisions?

Mr. STEINER. Yes.

Mr. FINO. On the demonstration city program, because of its financial needs and concentration on the very limited number of cities, would it not seriously place in jeopardy new urban renewal operations outside the demonstration city program?

Mr. STEINER. I am sorry to ask you to repeat, sir.

Mr. FINO. On the demonstration city program, because of its financial needs and its concentration in a very limited number of cities, would it not seriously place in jeopardy new urban renewal operations outside the demonstration city program?

Mr. STEINER. It would seem so to me.

Mr. FINO. Just one more question. I have seen that the real estate board has changed its position on the rent subsidy. Has the chamber also changed its position on that?

Mr. STEINER. Our position was enunciated—

Mr. FINO. On the rent supplement?

Mr. STEINER. We have not had a formal position on the rent supplements. This question was asked last year of Mr. Robert P. Gerholz who is now president of national chamber. As I recall, he indicated that rent supplements provision is a device which seems to him preferable to public housing as a course of action for helping low income persons. But we have not officially taken a position on rent supplements. This was an expression of personal judgment.

Mr. FINO. That is what I was going to ask you. That was his own personal opinion and does not reflect the thinking and feelings of the organization?

Mr. STEINER. It was Mr. Gerholz's opinion.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. Reuss?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Steiner, on two recent occasions I have had the opportunity to commend and congratulate the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for its factual and constructive testimony—on the Asian Development Bank hearing a few weeks ago, and earlier this week on the so-called Muskie bill before the House Committee on Government Operations. However, having heard the chamber's testimony here today, I am obliged to say that I find it unbelievably negative, back-