

ducted, you and your associates in North Carolina. It was of tremendous value to us to know something of your efforts and your findings when we drafted this. So, as one who has become really enthusiastic about this, I am glad to pay my respects to you and your associates for the part you played in developing this bill to this point.

I think your characterization of the child of poverty today being a parent of poverty tomorrow probably strikes the most sensitive chord in this whole poverty picture. All of us know that never are we going to eliminate this factor of poverty in our society. What we are going to try to do, and what we hope to do, as you previously said, is to break the cycle of it. And until we do break the cycle of it, we are permitting second, third, and fourth generations of poverty to pyramid the problems that that disease creates throughout America.

One of the businessmen told us yesterday—I believe it was Mr. Martin—that if a business found itself in the condition that some of our communities and some of our areas in the country are in that it would immediately stop, take inventory, and devise some means of trying to remedy those problems and get them out of the way; for if it didn't, the business would die. And then he stated as trustees of the public interest, of the society that we have, that we as Congressmen were responsible for doing likewise, or else we might be charged with letting a nation, our form of government, die.

While I am tremendously pleased, joyous almost, over the opportunity to hear such magnificent presentations as you have presented here this morning, I am equally concerned that a great many Members of Congress have deprived themselves of hearing argument in favor of a program that probably no one who thoroughly understood the problem could oppose. I hope your statement will be read by every Member of the House of Representatives. I believe it to be the most practical approach from an elected official's standpoint that I have seen.

I want to ask you one or two questions. Is it your feeling that the community action section provides sufficient safeguards for the Governor of a State or for the local officials of a community to have a sufficient voice in the management of these community programs?

Governor SANFORD. I would certainly hope that that would be the intention of the Director. I think as far as whether or not it is spelled out completely enough, I am not certain. I do think it would be the intention of the proposed Director to give the States a voice, and I think it would be a great mistake not to. This simply cannot be done effectively, if it is going to be done in a way that requires too much redtape and too many devices of central control.

I think it can be done very effectively with State leadership operating within the proposed guidelines that are set up by Congress and by the administration of the act. But I think we would miss a tremendous resource, if we did not call the State leadership into an important role. I think the States can contribute and are anxious to contribute and have the capacity to contribute the leadership which would spell the difference between success and failure. Then, I think the States, in turn, would make a tremendous mistake if they did not call on local leadership, as we have demonstrated is readily available to State leadership, because this involves enough people to see that the problems locally are defined and designed and carried out. And