

new revenue program primarily because of the cost of our program of education. We see that this is going to cost more money simply because there are more youngsters coming along. This is the most expensive segment of society; namely, young people, and if we educate them properly in our public schools, that alone will consume all the money that the normal State can raise.

Mr. BRADEMAs. You meet with Governors frequently in your position. Do you find, in conversations on this problem with your gubernatorial colleagues, that the shortage of finances is the chief hurdle for them to overcome in meeting this problem at the State level?

Governor WELSH. I would say this would be the normal problem which must be overcome in order to have a program that will be successful and do a job of training these young people to give them a skill. For, unless you can give them a skill so that they can go out and become a responsible taxpaying member of society, you have not accomplished anything. This is going to be an investment.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI (presiding). Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Governor WELSH, you have on the first page of your statement here the number of families who have incomes of less than \$3,000—\$8,000 according to the census of 4 years ago. How did that change in 10 years?

Governor WELSH. I don't believe I can answer that question. You mean to what extent did it increase?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. Now, the national figures indicate there has been a decrease. Your statement indicates, by saying they reached 88,000, that they must have increased in Indiana. I would like to know what caused them to increase in Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

I would like to ask unanimous consent to include in the record the article of Mr. Nossiter, to which I made reference earlier.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The article referred to follows:)

IT WILL BE A LONG WAR

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

In what the President has called an unconditional war on poverty, the administration is aiming at nothing less than the destruction of the cultural conditions that cause and perpetuate poverty in the United States. Because his is a vast and largely unexplored territory and because so many different disciplines will be called upon to penetrate it, an evaluation of the administration's program on economic grounds alone is impossible. Precisely how long it will last and what it will cost is anybody's guess. Nevertheless, some educated estimates about the program's future are worth noting. For example, Robert Lampman, of the University of Wisconsin, thinks that 30 years is a feasible goal. Another economist, one of the principal architects of the administration's strategy, contends that at least two generations will be needed to eradicate poverty in East Harlem alone. In sum, the most informed guesses foresee a campaign lasting several decades.

Lampman's views are entitled to special respect on several grounds. His paper in 1959 before the Joint Economic Committee was the first of the recent attempts to define and describe the dimensions of contemporary poverty. Lampman's unique contribution was to demonstrate that the percentage of the population defined as poverty stricken fell rapidly during the first postwar decade of reasonably high employment and relatively healthy growth, but much more