

be happy to comment on such situations but if I may present my statement first, there are some matters which bear on this so it would save the time of the committee and avoid repetition.

In his testimony before the Employment Manpower and Poverty Subcommittee of the Senate, Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Sargent Shriver, the Administrator of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said:

We have learned that while organization for change is a vital ingredient of Community Action, lawlessness and partisanship can undermine the integrity of the program and destroy the faith of the community.

And so we have written into the Bill safeguards against the use of federal funds for illegal picketing or demonstrations or partisan political activity.

We urge that this committee give consideration to including in the Economic Opportunity Act a statement setting forth what persons connected with OEO projects can do when they decide to become involved in action programs designed to bring about what they believe to be a desirable change in the economic, social, and political life of the Nation.

Such a positive statement of rights will help to put whatever restrictions are placed on the activities of persons connected with OEO projects in a frame of reference consistent with the first amendment of the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court related to that amendment.

Also, we urge the committee to include language in the act designed to protect persons connected with OEO projects from coercive action designed, for example, to bring about their participation in political activity.

The next concern is under the heading of local initiative. Under this heading the policy statement by the general board includes this paragraph:

We fully recognize that many aspects of the war on poverty transcend the local community, and many of the resources required for its successful prosecution must be mobilized on a national level.

Within the framework of local-state-federal partnership, we commend the emphasis in this Act upon maximum local initiative, imaginative creativity, and flexibility.

We have noted with approval that even when the decision has been made to launch programs such as Headstart and Upward Bound, vigorous efforts have been made to relate them to the objectives of the local community action programs.

Both of these programs open up opportunities for reaching the families of participants that might not otherwise be opened up. It is our understanding, for example, that the preponderant majority of Headstart grants are made to Community Action agencies, and that these agencies in turn use a wide variety of organizations to operate Headstart programs.

We have noted with interest that in the full-year Headstart programs, 10 percent of the operating agencies are church affiliated organizations.

We are confident that in the redrafting of the Economic Opportunity Act, the committee will do everything it can to continue the emphasis on maximum local initiative.

We hope especially that the act will make clear that proposals developed by the poor will receive a hearing on their merits even though