

(Article in daily newspaper "The Nonpareil" of Council Bluffs, Iowa, follows:)

OEO HAS BEEN SPENDING MILLIONS—CONGRESS WANTS TO KNOW WHAT THE MONEY'S BUYING

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Anti-poverty director Sargent Shriver and his lieutenants are spending millions trying to find out what is wrong with the widely controversial program—apparently with few tangible results.

According to the latest available official figures, as of June 30, 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administers the anti-poverty program, had spent \$7,788,365 on scores of studies, analyses, assessments, inquiries and various other surveys—none of which appear to get at the real problems of poverty, such as training the unemployed and providing jobs for them.

This \$7,788,365 expenditure was out of approximately \$2.3 billion voted by Congress for OEO up to that date.

Unofficial and incomplete compilations for the current fiscal year indicate the rate of spending for this costly self-examination is running even greater. OEO's budget for this fiscal year is \$1.612 billion—making a total of more than \$3.9 billion since 1964 when this Great Society program was launched.

STUDIES NOT PUBLISHED

Very little is known publicly about this multi-million dollar aspect of OEO operations. OEO officials have said nothing about it, and the reports of these studies are not published.

Congressional authorities in charge of anti-poverty legislation only recently have begun digging into this matter. They are uncovering much pay-dirt.

Foremost among their findings is that a large percentage of these surveys and evaluations have all the earmarks of being boondoggles: funds dished out solely for the purpose of providing certain individuals, concerns, organizations and colleges with projects.

Significantly indicative of this is the large number of Head Start studies of various kinds, as shown by the following partial list:

\$498,773 to the Educational Testing Service, no address given, for an "Evaluation of Project Head Start"; \$262,369 to Lear Siegler Services, no address, for a study of "Administrative Services & Related Support for Head Start"; \$533,256 to the same company for a survey of the "Organization and Teaching of Orientation Programs for Head Start Child Development Staff"; \$58,000 to the University of Wisconsin for "Study of Head Start Program."

Also under congressional scrutiny are numerous costly studies with imposing titles but of no known value. Presumably reports were submitted to OEO, but few have reached the lawmakers.

Illustrative of these projects are the following:

\$183,666 to West Virginia University for an "Evaluation of the Community Action Program (CAP) for McDowell City"; \$200,378 to the University of Kentucky for an "Evaluation of CAP"; \$106,670 to International Research Assn., no address, for an "Evaluation of Programs for Migrant Farm Workers"; \$40,000 to Kirschner Associates, no address, for an "Evaluation of Small Business Development Centers."

TAKE AN EINSTEIN TO FATHOM

One ornate report obtained by members of the House Labor and Education Committee, on an \$82,522 "Analysis of Alternative Hypothetical Urban CAPs," has left them completely mystified.

It's a conglomeration of unintelligible jargon, baffling references and citations, incomprehensible tables, charts, formulas and graphs, and pages and pages of mathematical equations—which would take an Einstein to fathom. Of the approximate 50 pages of the report, about the size of a telephone book, more than half consist of these bewildering hieroglyphics.

Graphically illustrative of the perplexing nature of this document are the following extracts from the "General Conclusion:"

"The small area model's forecast of employment and the distribution of this employment projection among the occupational classes is certainly one area in