

a necessary supplement to and extension of existing Federal-local programs whose accepted objectives essentially are the same—to make a better, healthier, and more productive America. There is no need to do more than tick them off here: Programs for housing, urban renewal, accelerated public works, hospitals, schools, job training, juvenile delinquency control, and libraries.

What the pending proposal does is to wheel up weapons and ammunition together for the first time for a coordinated, concerted, multifront offensive against the patterns of poverty in our economic and social wastelands—patterns in which families existing on less than subsistence levels are enmeshed, along with illiterate rejects, jobless school dropouts, displaced and discarded unskilled workers, disadvantaged minorities, all of the legions who find their lives luckless and hopeless.

In short, the act proposes to do something purposeful about human deterioration, to make human renewal at least as important as the renewal of the Nation's physical plant.

And I submit that the administration's price tag for the act—\$962.5 million for fiscal 1965—represents a bargain for the Nation even if the bill brings not much more than a start to the undertaking in the year ahead.

As a mayor, I am particularly struck by the potentials for the common good opened up by title II of the act, through community action programs initiated locally on a share-the-cost basis, to improve the lot of the Nation's cities and the underdeveloped people who live in them.

For this sector of the antipoverty offensive in rural as well as urban communities \$315 million would be earmarked to be used for Federal participation in local projects. Under the bill's provisions, the Federal share in financing the plans would be no more than 75 percent of costs normally, although exceptions up to 90 percent could be made in cases where municipal budgets already are fully committed and added local revenue sources can't be found immediately. In addition, local governments must demonstrate that they have in no way diminished the efforts they have already undertaken.

The Nation's cities have borne by far the greater load in the fight against poverty up to this time. We have done well to hold our own in this struggle. We welcome the Federal Government to the battle and pledge our continued effort so that the war can be won.

Mayors of cities in the U.S. Conference of Mayors stand ready, I am sure, to see to it that they fulfill their financing responsibilities and to answer "Yea" to questions about any local plan they advance to further the war against poverty:

1. Does it demonstrate a basic knowledge of the facts of poverty in the area?
2. Does it propose to attack the real causes of poverty?
3. Does it promise effective solution to the problems which it identifies?
4. Are there community organizations which will work together to carry out the plan responsibly, speedily, and efficiently?
5. Is the community itself dedicated to the achievement of the goals, contributing its own human and financing resources toward that objective?