

good cross-section, particularly with some programs, in order to have the necessary ingredients to effectuate particularly a manpower program.

You must have management, corporations, labor and you must have the one who wants a job.

Mr. QUIE. You notice so often that the manpower board is made up of the employer and labor, organized labor, but usually the people who are to be helped are not represented on those boards.

Mr. HOLMES. This is where the muscle from the board will give direction. You have to make reports. If you don't have the power on the board, so to speak, nothing will be done.

Mr. QUIE. Also, the same would be true in the health field and the welfare field—the same kind of strength in improving the effectiveness of the program—Community Action operation could be affected there, would that not be true?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. I want you to know as this is written up in the paper our proposal would eliminate OEO. The intent is not to remove the stimuli but to find a means of increasing it, of extending it to the other \$30 billion of Federal, not just the \$2 billion. This is the suggestion we have made to be considered during the hearings.

Whether that is the approach we will take in the final legislation is hard to tell but we are looking for a way. It may be a different way than has been brought about. I agree with you that some way must be found to stimulate the involvement of the poor.

Before yielding to my colleague from California, I would like at this point to insert a statement from Dr. Arthur B. Shostak, associate professor, Department of Social Sciences, Drexel Institute of Science and Technology, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to his observations and recommendations concerning the Community Action Program and related matters, which I believe will be of interest to the committee. I now yield to Mr. Bell.

(The statement of Dr. Arthur B. Shostak follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR B. SHOSTAK, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, DREXEL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to have my observations and reform recommendations entered into the Record. As a professional researcher and writer, I have spent the last three years examining the anti-poverty problem and the various reform efforts addressed to this problem. I have done field research in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Boston, Wilmington, Trenton, New York and, most especially, Philadelphia. I have published on the subject in *American Child*, *Social Work*, *Social Forces*, and *The Annals*; I have co-edited the first paperback anthology on poverty, *New Perspectives on Poverty* (Spectrum, 1964) and have edited a rare anthology of first-person accounts of efforts to use sociology to alleviate human suffering (*Sociology in Action*—Dorsey, 1966). In the Fall, and again in the Winter of 1967, two new anthologies will appear containing lengthy essays of mine evaluating the progress thus far made—or missed—in the War on Poverty.

I propose in this brief statement to focus on recommendations, and only the key among these, in several vital areas:

I. INVOLVEMENT OF THE POOR

Experience makes plain the need for OEO-sponsored and joint OEO-local CAP rule over compulsory staff training for all non-professional elected representatives of the poor. Philadelphia, to cite just one of several possible examples, has failed thusfar to secure OEO approval for a Training Institute—and this has cost dearly in the skills of the 144 elected spokesmen for the poor.