I do think that we must make some observations concerning the proposal that we have before us, which is H.R. 6558. He has directed his legislation at low-cost housing under the Housing Act of 1937 and

I am in complete agreement with this.

However, I would say just prior to the introduction of his bill, I did a survey of the Federal housing in the large cities of this Nation for which funds had never been received under Public Law 874 with the exception of the three cities that have qualified at different times. Large numbers of housing construction projects start as Federal pro-

jects but are later turned over to the municipalities.

This housing remains, no tax base, the boys and girls are there, and the Federal Government withdraws. I think that the proposal that this be reinstated—and, by the way, this would not only apply to large city districts. Take, for example, in Mr. Ford's district where there are a number of school districts which are underway. With Mr. Ford's permission, I will send him a complete report on the number of housing units that still remain and create problems in those school districts. Mr. O'Hara's district has a number of the same problems and, indeed, many of these gentlemen here at the table still face some housing that has been vacated by the Federal Government, and it is partly the reason that they are faced with this business of low per-pupil valuation because the Federal Government did indeed bring these facilities there; the kids are there, with no tax base and, as a result, that is why they are forced to report this type of low valuation.

I would call to your attention the public housing survey that is attached to my testimony. There is the report on 12 of our cities. It seems to me that it is something that deserves some consideration when we take a look at the number of units built as Federal projects— 136,434. These are units for which, in most instances, with the exception of San Diego, any funds were ever flowing from Public Law 874. This would be translated at the rate of 1.43 pupils if you analyze the other columns there, and it would show you the tremendous number of boys and girls who are living in these metropolitan areas that are not receiving any kind of assistance except that under the title 1 of

the Elementary and Secondary Act.

I would say that the funds are directed into those communities where the housing projects are; namely, because the housing projects have become this kind of center where the low-income family is found. In reality, without some way to buttress the tax base that we do not have for those people in the houses, we are actually diluting the amount of money we are receiving under the bill for special project areas.

I believe you indicated a 10-minute time limit, Mr. Ford. I will close at this particular time and be ready to answer any questions

when you get to that stage later today.

Mr. Ford. Thank you.

Before leaving, the chairman asked me to recess the meeting until this afternoon, so we will continue with this panel when we reconvene,

with the next panel immediately behind them.

I see Mr. Lillywhite here and although we do not have your name on the schedule, Mr. Lillywhite, we had testimony from the Commissioner of Education the other day that he has some prospective amend-