

Congressman Pucinski just a few minutes ago mentioned the program in Chicago which took people off relief. It was called jobs now. That program started in Chicago. Nobody down in Washington thought of that program. That program started there. It turned out to be a success there and it became the basis for a national program modeled on jobs now in Chicago which has been taken by the Labor Department to a hundred or more cities in the United States.

Now that program was not approved by us or by Congress before it was started. It was done under a local initiative idea.

Finally, let me just say I remember vividly one of the first times I came over here Congressman Goodell being complimentary about Headstart. He claimed, I remember, that it was really his idea, that he had attempted for 3 or 4 years to get it approved by the Congress.

If I remember correctly he said if we had waited for Congress to approve it we never would have started it. So he actually commended us for doing the opposite of what you suggest we not do.

I just wanted to aline the Congressman with us on this important matter.

Mr. GOODELL. You are in trouble now with me.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, sir, I am delighted to have you on our side.

Mr. GOODELL. I do agree with your comment. You are perfectly accurate on how it started. I don't agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do believe these programs have a high degree of flexibility.

There must be power in the law for local people to initiate new programs and set their own priorities. I will say in just the short time I have—as you imagine I have a good many questions I want to ask you—statistics can be used for a variety of purposes and they can give a false impression.

For instance, I think the chart you have put up here indicates 50,000 persons who were poor are employed as CAP workers. It is my understanding the Anglovitch fund studies of nonprofessionals of CAP reflected that only 16 percent of the nonprofessional CAP's were filled by people whose income was less than \$4,000.

Yesterday I read in the New York Times a story that emanated from OEO that 53 percent of Job Corps graduates had jobs. Fifty-three percent sounds impressive. It is my understanding that the Lew Harris poll on the Job Corps graduates indicated that before they went in, 58 percent of them had jobs. Fifty-three percent of the graduates having jobs does not sound very impressive when you look at 58 percent who had jobs before they went into the Job Corps.

Less than one-quarter of those working after they got out of the Job Corps say they are using Job Corps training. This is a significant aspect.

We are spending a lot of money. I am sure it is helping a good many youngsters. We have the obligation to see that the money is spent effectively. The fact that only one-quarter of those who got out of Job Corps use Job Corps training is pretty bad. Actually they are only 15 percent of the total number of enrolees in Job Corps—one-quarter of the graduates.

I would like in the short time available today to concentrate on the specific thing that is current and very important.

The CEP program started out as UCEP and now it is concentrated employment program. I am deeply concerned about it. We are about to