

Now when we are talking about that amount, compared to the money we are spending in other areas, and in this program as far as that is concerned, it could conceivably have a rather great stimulative effect. If it applies to all expenses in training and educating, training and upgrading employees, it would then be a very simple tax procedure.

In other words, what I am trying to establish, and I won't go into it since you have indicated that you are not an expert, it can be done across the board with a ceiling of something like \$300 million.

Mr. ROBIE. I think Mr. Erlenborn also asked some questions along that line and I am happy to repeat some uneducated fears about the administrative problems of Government subsidies across the board for all kinds of training, including upgrading training and so on.

Mr. GOODELL. It would be through tax credit.

Mr. ROBIE. I guess I must say I just have not given this enough thought to be able to comment intelligently. My problems have been pretty much focused on the youth problem which seems to be one of the major national problems we have in a time of great prosperity.

Mr. GOODELL. That is another way to focus it. You could just set up a program for which only youngsters under 22 years of age would qualify.

Mr. ROBIE. That is where my attention has been focused and I don't think I can be helpful on commenting on the other.

Mr. GOODELL. You have been extremely helpful to the committee and I thank you for testifying today.

(The following material was submitted by Mr. Robie:)

AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY,  
Hartford, Conn., July 18, 1967.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,  
Representative in Congress,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You may find it helpful to have the views of a businessman on the legislative and budget proposals for the Office of Economic Opportunity now before the House. I urge prompt, favorable action.

Through OEO we have begun our first organized assault on the causes of poverty. Conventional welfare programs serve the needs of those who are temporarily poor because of industrial layoffs, disability, loss of the breadwinner or age. A different kind of help is needed for those disadvantaged by birth or upbringing.

We need both kinds of programs. If OEO receives generous support now, it may succeed eventually in making itself unnecessary by removing the causes of hard-core poverty. The logic, economy and humanity of turning tax-spenders into tax-payers is obvious.

As a member of the Business Leadership Advisory Council to OEO, I am informed as well as interested in the services it performs nationally and in Connecticut. To give you examples of OEO at work, I am enclosing a report on the Community Action Program in Hartford. Such activities place demands on the consciences of all more fortunate Americans.

Sincerely yours,

OLCOTT D. SMITH, *Chairman.*

#### REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM IN HARTFORD, JULY 1967

Hartford saw the need for the Community Action Program approach early. In 1962 the Greater Hartford Community Renewal Team (CRT), which became the Community Action Agency there, was established. Its purpose was to coordinate a number of existing programs and to formulate the new ones needed