

in Mississippi. But there are crises resulting from poverty in all parts of our country, North, South, East and West, rural, urban and suburban.

The Administration request for federal FY 1967 does not measure up to these critical needs, nor does it measure up to the conservative projections of expansion originally outlined by the Office of Economic Opportunity. OEO said, in 1964, that overall expenditures in its third year of operation would be at least \$3.5 billion. And this was said before the adoption, in subsequent years, of such worthwhile provisions as the Nelson, Scheuer, Kennedy and Javits amendments.

Further, the 1967 amendments provide for a justifiable expansion of attacks on rural poverty. To fund these adequately within the limits of a \$2.06 billion authorization, and with earmarking of a significant proportion of Title II funds, would most likely result in a freeze or further cuts in versatile urban CAP funding beyond those occasioned by inadequate funding in FY 1966.

NFS therefore urges a doubling of OEO authorization and appropriation from \$2.06 billion to \$4 billion for federal FY 1967.

#### *Job Corps*

*T.H. 1A, Section 105, Screening and Selection (of applicants)—Special Limitations*, tampers with, if it does not completely destroy the original intent of the Job Corps, a service for youth handicapped in their own community by reason of previous behavior or "label." These are youth who are most in need of a properly conducted residential setting if they are to have any chance of "making it."

Further, this Section is well nigh impossible to administer. It asks that the screening agent make projections as to future behavior of all individual applicants as well as ruling out all youth with a record of "behavioral aberrations." Those of us who have worked with delinquent youth know that motivation for change in behavior comes at different periods for each youth. We have found many a "late bloomer," who despite a record of repetitive delinquent acts is indeed ready for rehabilitative help. Section 105 would deny such youth the Job Corps as a new opportunity for breaking away from the delinquent behavior pattern.

Criteria for screening out so-called undesirable Job Corps applicants can only result in "creaming" the best of the youth and refusing service to many who are most in need of a residential service outside their own neighborhood. We therefore recommend that Section 105, Title I, be deleted.

#### *Governor's Veto*

Title I—Section 115(c) provides for the governor of any state the power of absolute veto over the establishment of a Job Corps center or similar facility within it. We would recommend that the provisions of this part and that of similar sections under other titles of the bill (e.g. Vista, Title VIII, Section 810(b)) be made consistent with that of *Title II, Section 242*, which authorizes reconsideration by the Director of OEO and the overriding by him of any such veto. In the interest of effective programming, the resources of the Federal government and its anti-poverty programs should be made equally available to all citizens and in all states as a matter of right.

#### *Political Activity*

Title I, Section 118(b), Title II, Section 214(a) and (b), and Title VIII, Section 810(b) seek to extend the application of the Hatch Act and other limitations on citizen action to enrollees and to employees of agencies, institutions and organizations engaged in the War on Poverty.

Much of the direction of the bill under these Sections seems to be toward precluding the participation of individual enrollees, CAP organizations, grantee and delegate agencies in continuing efforts for community and institutional change. Indications of this intent are found in the language proscribing picketing and protest and, under Title II, authorizing the Director of OEO to promulgate rules or regulations "*which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action activities with financial assistance (from OEO) . . . governing conflicts of interest, use of position of authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community.*"

NFS is strongly opposed to these Sections of the bill as an invasion of the rights of individuals and autonomous organizations, and asks that they be deleted.