

been contributing. In the end won't you just have the same trouble with funds?

Mr. SHISHKIN. Of course, if they don't provide them you have trouble with funds.

But I have a recommendation here in my statement on that that I want to call your attention to in dealing with the Urban Renewal Act of 1966.

On page 9, you will note that our convention has asked for an amendment to the bill that would "increase the Federal grant from two-thirds to three-quarters of net project cost."

And that is the recommendation I have submitted.

Mr. WIDNALL. The great labor organizations that you represent has had a long and oftentimes the originating interest in low-income housing legislation. And this is clearly on the record, and you have done everything you could to endorse and enforce that type of legislation. Now, isn't it a matter of concern to you that in cities demonstration program legislation there are added so many other new programs that can claim part of the money in connection with improvements within the city, and possibly to the detriment of low-income housing? Do you think that the money that will be made available to the cities will be distributed so widely that you won't have an effective attack on real slums and get the low-income housing that you so badly need?

Mr. SHISHKIN. No, Mr. Widnall; I think that these two programs were not in conflict, and I don't think they are even competitive. I think the cities demonstration is a demonstration of the need for clearing up these very dire situations, these very critical situations, and that the President's message has called for mass attack on housing needs. And I think that it is elementary that such an attack will not be successful unless new housing is provided, including public housing.

Mr. BARRETT. If you move people you have to give them good, safe, and sound housing.

Mr. SHISHKIN. That is correct. And not only that, but even in the public housing program itself, you know, there have been problems of various kinds, and these can be remedied if there is attention paid not only to the physical shelter, but also to the health of the people who are disadvantaged and who are in need of help and training and finding employment, and problems of that kind.

So I think these two are harmonious and go together. I don't think they are in conflict.

Mr. WIDNALL. Do you have any views on how many cities can be effectively helped with the amount of funds proposed in this program? It is quite apparent that not every city in the United States is going to get money for a demonstration program. And it is quite apparent that three or four of the big cities could use all of the money that is presently in this program. Do you have in mind any numbers as to cities that could be helped? I am inclined to feel that if an attempt is made to help 60 or 70, you are going to water down the program so much that you can't do an effective job in any community.

Mr. SHISHKIN. Well, I think, as I have told Mr. St Germain just a minute ago, I think that the important thing here is to establish priorities of need, where the need is most critical, urgent and pressing, and address ourselves to that first, and which ones are found to be in