

Washington but of local officials who apparently have the veto power over the program.

Now I can understand why in some areas, I would not refer to Chicago but I would in this respect because I believe Chicago is doing a good job, that some local officials I think have some dedication to the problem but in many areas local officials are afraid of arousing the poor. They have read of the poor being articulate and expressing themselves and for that reason they are keeping the poor from any meaningful participation in the program.

I think in those areas where such local officials are to have the veto power that they should either have it according to the law or else they should participate in the funding of the program.

But to tell the poor people in some areas, including Los Angeles, that they have involvement and yet the local officials are running the program as they see fit and not always efficiently and in behalf of the poor, to me is telling people that we have given them something and we lead them to expect something and then they do not obtain it.

I think this is largely the cause of the unrest and disorders that have occurred in Los Angeles. We should do something about it.

Secondly, I also want to join in a criticism of innovation for innovation's sake.

I think that the new concentrated employment program was badly handled. It was launched under rather strange circumstances. I think it has made for much confusion and it is an accumulation of many programs, many of which have been in operation for more than a year.

We have a right to ask why these benefits were not made available to the areas before now and why it is that suddenly these programs are put together and then launched in a sense as a new program.

It is difficult obviously when you concentrate certain job programs in some areas, to explain to persons who live in those areas where they do not benefit, why we are taking certain programs and benefits and services away from one area and putting them in another area.

It is impossible to tell poor people who live on 67th Street why they don't qualify when persons who are better off who live on 65th Street do qualify. It is difficult to tell certain individuals who are engaged in building manpower development programs why they are not included, why they are overlooked by local administration.

I think we should give a second look to constant development of new programs involving a lot of waste and planning and retooling when we do not concentrate on making the older programs work.

I certainly believe that we should in a sense slow down in the starting of many new programs. The time has come when we should concentrate on the older programs and particularly on getting jobs for the unemployed. That to me is the basic reason behind the War on Poverty.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will you yield?

Mr. HAWKINS. I yield if I have any time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The statement about the participation of the poor, one of the most revealing statements made today, certainly is the best measure of the degree to which the poor have been involved in the program. The statement made by Mr. Berry and Mr. Shriver that out of some 1,000 community action programs across the country your study shows that only eight have not reached the minimal criteria.