

on that. I think that is all we have in mind on this. I don't think there is any need for me to elaborate on this. I think the record is clear.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. No need for what?

Mr. SHISHKIN. I don't think there is any need for me to elaborate that. I think our position is clear.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. You agree with the definition given by Mr. Cohen?

Mr. SHISHKIN. That is correct. The only thing I think Mr. Cohen should have emphasized more, and he has not done so in his testimony, is that the real benefit here is to the user of this service, to the patient. It is not a program for the doctors; it is a program for the patients. It is a very important consumer program. It is a very important public program. It meets the need of the people.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. And lastly, on page 11 "provision should also be made for permitting inclusion of nursing facilities in section 231 of Elderly Housing Projects." Do I take that literally to mean actual nursing facilities within a unit? Say it is a high-rise apartment for the elderly: in that particular unit would you have some nursing facilities, or a unit that would be taken up entirely with nursing facilities?

Mr. SHISHKIN. Well, it depends on the local situation. But wherever possible I think that there should be provision for nursing facilities where the elderly are housed, in housing for the elderly, I am not particularly in sympathy with the concept of separating them in one unit, but if housing is provided I think it is well to provide the necessary facilities on the premises.

But there have been other problems involving similar facilities. Take, for example, a project in which those who are housed include working mothers. And there has been some question about having provision made in that housing project for day care for children. Well, if the working mother has no one to sit with the baby, she is deprived of an opportunity for employment. So day care centers should also be permitted. And that should be also indicated as well as nursing care for the elderly who are in need of it.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Thank you.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Shishkin, for your testimony this morning. We are certainly glad to have you.

Mr. SHISHKIN. I appreciate greatly your courtesy and hospitality. And I am very glad to have this opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BARRETT. Thank you, sir.

(The statement of the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Urban America follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON URBAN AMERICA, FEBRUARY 28, 1966, BAL HARBOUR, FLA.

For 2 years in a row, residential building has been out of step with the rest of the U.S. economy. Added to the previous deficits in the volume of new housing built within the reach of moderate- and low-income families, this lag has resulted in a far-reaching imbalance in America's economic development.

Urban action is needed to deal with this fundamental economic problem. In the fiscal year 1967, starting next July 1, according to a census estimate, basic population factors should increase the rate of household formation by 180,000. This increase alone calls for a corresponding increase in housing starts. A much greater step-up in starts is necessary to redress the accumulated deficits of previous years to make possible the rehousing of families living in slums and substandard homes and those doubled up in overcrowded tenements.