

In any event, the illusion which was in the newspaper involved one paragraph on page 22 of a statement which was totally the opposite of that particular point.

I just thought I would get that clear and we will be happy to supply the entire testimony so you can put it in the House side, if you would like.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scheuer, will you yield to Mr. Burton?

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Will you please supply in your response to the gentleman from Iowa the response from the mayor of New York, which is one that he supports or opposes?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would be glad to do that, too.

(Mayor Lindsay's prepared statement and Whitney M. Young's testimony follow:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I welcome the opportunity to talk with you about the most important problem facing our City: the plight of almost 2 million men, women and children locked in poverty. The scope of the problem can be spelled out in some figures. The number of poor people in this city is as large as the entire population of Philadelphia. New York City's anti-poverty programs operate out of more than 1,200 locations throughout the five boroughs. Close to 300 organizations and delegate agencies are involved in running these programs. New York City has as many school children as there are people in Baltimore. Half of these children, a number equal to the population of Cincinnati, need special programs and services.

I hope that you will have the opportunity during the next two days to travel around the City to test for yourselves both the dimensions of the problem and our commitment to its solution.

As a Member of Congress I gave strong support to the 1964 anti-poverty legislation. Since becoming Mayor, my perspective on urban legislation and urban policy has changed. However, my continued full support for the concepts and programs that were embodied in the legislation of 1964 has not changed. It has been confirmed.

In those early days of the war against poverty, the strong support which the program had in Congress was not fully or enthusiastically shared in all cities and communities. Many city administrations were concerned that the community action program might turn out to be a threat to the exercise of their traditional authority.

Today in New York City and in several of the largest metropolitan centers in the country the situation is reversed. In 1967 mayors and urban administrators are among the program's most enthusiastic and knowledgeable supporters, while many in Congress seem to be losing some of their earlier faith in the principle of community action and local initiative.

The conduct of the war against poverty has been dogged by undue expectation. Many people thought that success would come almost overnight, and were disappointed when the quality of the slum neighborhoods did not change as fast as they expected.

Clearly, we have had our frustrations. Some community organizations find it difficult to develop administrative skills which meet the exacting standards of inspectors and auditors. In many communities, misunderstandings about the nature and purpose of the program, as well as distrust of the intentions of established institutions, including City Hall, slow the pace of development. In addition, the anti-poverty program—with its multiple funding and the major role assigned to delegate agencies in the community—poses unique administrative problems.

Here in New York City, we are doing something about the obstacles that are hobbling performance. We have completely re-fashioned the administrative structure of our anti-poverty program. We have developed more effective procedures to streamline operations. Yet much remains to be done to ease the flow of paper and money from funding sources through the City's administrative and fiscal