

I guess you could say that is not an exaggeration. However, when you take an impressive figure like 4 million or 8 million people who have been touched and we don't know what the dickens "touched" means—it certainly doesn't mean meaningful impact—then your claim exaggerates the real effects of the war on poverty. It seems to us that this doesn't serve a particularly good cause.

Mr. SHRIVER. Those figures are compiled by the research and planning department. Sarge is not putting them out. They come from there.

Mr. GOODELL. It is your agency.

Mr. SHRIVER. They are the best figures it is possible for us to obtain. Everybody likes to know what the figures are, what are you doing? These are the best figures we could come up with. Suppose we had touched 6 million of 5 million or 7 million people. That still leaves five times as many people untouched and that is what we are talking about all the time. If there are 32 million people in the United States that are poor we are not touching even one out of four with 8 million.

Mr. GOODELL. Reached, affected, served, touched, all of these words are misleading. I quote another outstanding authority who has made many of these studies and he said:

Unsupported claims of achievements and exaggerated official promises for the Federal war on poverty regrettably have serious repercussions.

Mr. LEVINE. On that 7 million or 9 million people, it should be clear that neither my Department nor Mr. Shriver has ever claimed anything for that figure aside from what you have said. There are people who have passed through that we don't know how we have affected.

Mr. GOODELL. What does touched mean?

Mr. LEVINE. It means perhaps they have been in a neighborhood center. In fact, Mr. Shriver never meant anything but that.

Mr. GOODELL. Why take this great big figure and say that they have been touched by the war on poverty? It sounds like you have really made a major accomplishment.

Mr. LEVINE. We haven't tried to make it sound like that.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Shriver, I saw a report in one of the newspapers the other day that had a survey on the amount of time that youngsters, who have gone through the community action program and receive training stay on the job. It indicated that they stay about 90 days on the average before they move to some other job. These are youngsters who are properly trained, motivated or anything else.

I was wondering if you have an explanation for the kind of mobility that this would reflect among the people in your programs.

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know the precise program to which you refer.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Job Corps program, young people who have been aided by the community action programs. I was impressed by the rather interesting figure that they only stay in one job for 90 days or less.

Mr. SHRIVER. I think I would be better able to respond to the question if I had a chance to go into it. We would be glad to put it in the record. These youngsters particularly in this age group are extremely volatile and mobile whether they are poor or rich kids. At