

This is partly sociological in terms of the problems that evolve from it. Many things happen as a result of poverty. And they are a blight on our Nation and hang like a heavy cross on our consciences. When people are not given the opportunity to make a living and they resort to some of the things that they do in order to subsist, this is inexcusable to us. Many times the social problems cause a mass migration, a dislocation of relationships that make it much easier for a person away from home to violate the accepted codes of conduct than it would be if they were at home.

As Mr. Johnson pointed out, these proud mountain people don't like relief. In the city, they are more ready to accept it because they do not have to carry the burden of disapproval of their mores through all these years that is present when they move from being self-sufficient over into relief rolls. This is a terrible experience for them. I am glad it is. I think this is a hopeful sign that people don't want to go this route any more than possible.

The thing that worries us, also, is the depressing effect that this kind of situation has on our total economy. People with productive capacity that are denied, through lack of training or various other causes, the right to make their contribution to American life certainly are no asset to us, and in many instances they are a liability. They are the ones who hang like a millstone about our whole economic life. This is true, not only of agriculture, but it is true of the rural nonfarm population where there is poverty.

In our judgment, nothing would contribute more to the economic stability of American life than to give these people an opportunity to develop a purchasing power that would enable them to share the good things of American life.

Last of all, let me say that I think that the political implications of this bill are much more far reaching than they have been given credit for. It is a historical fact that communism has never developed in an area that does not have a great deal of poverty. It develops around the shirtless ones or the unwashed ones, or whatever you want to call them, whether in Cuba or wherever it is. I think it is a tribute to the American people that many of these people who have been impoverished have not turned to communism. But by the same token the Communists have made this a point of reproach for us, and they do not, in their propaganda concerning America, talk about the widespread benefits of our society where we have the highest standards of living for most of our people of any nation in the history of the world. They point to the people, rather, who are living at subsistence levels or lower and these people then in turn, their whole situation becomes a millstone, hanging around the political neck of America.

We must, I think, in order not only to survive as this kind of government, but in order to survive as a government of respectability in terms of the nations of the world, be able to point to our impoverished people and say we have, to the best of the ability of the American people, relieved our people of need.

This bill points us in that general direction.

I would make two comments about the sections of the bill: One is about title II. Let me go back to title II and say that in our concept this community development concept must be developed even further than it is in ARD and Area Redevelopment Act. We have had