

Mr. SPEISER. That is correct. It is the extension of it here. I think there is an additional factor I might suggest and that is Job Corps enrollees are not Government employees and I think you are compounding the error by expanding it to cover individuals in that situation. The provision of the antipoverty program which covers employees and officers who are direct employees of the Government—

Chairman PERKINS. But you would have no objection to it covering the direct employees?

Mr. SPEISER. No. We have an objection to that because we basically disagree with the concept of the Hatch Act. Let me make it clear that we do not disagree with the provision of the Hatch Act that bars coercive political pressures on employees or officers of the Government but we are concerned with the provision which bars them from participating in political campaigns and activities as a way of sterilizing the process.

Chairman PERKINS. I just wish more members of the committee had been here. We have your statement in the record. Do you have any other material you want to put in the record?

Mr. SPEISER. I have three additional points. I recognize the hour is late, Mr. Chairman, and I will just briefly mention the other points as well.

Chairman PERKINS. You may go ahead.

Mr. SPEISER. There is an oath of allegiance that is required for Job Corps enrollees. It is the fairly standard kind of oath of allegiance that is required for persons who obtain employment. We object to that oath under the circumstances on the grounds that you are singling out these Job Corps enrollees who are not Government employees and making it a condition for them to get Federal financial grants. There is a wide range of Federal financial grants and subsidies and programs and there have only been two other instances in which I know an oath of allegiance has been required as getting them, the National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation which requires the oath of allegiance as a condition for getting fellowships or grants under those programs. We believe this demands the kind of oath which historically has been used in a ceremonial fashion for when individuals go into public office.

There is also an interesting problem I believe in the oath of allegiance, although it has a provision excluding nations as Cuba, in it effect, excludes or could have disastrous effects on aliens who are in this country who may very well be in need of the Job Corps program. Many countries have similar provisions similar to our laws which, although the question of the validity of our expatriation laws is very much in doubt, holds that an individual takes an oath of allegiance to a foreign country thereby loses his citizenship to the country to which he belongs and we do not feel this is a necessary condition for individuals being in the Job Corps.

Thirdly, we are opposed to the so-called Broyhill amendment which was not in this present bill but it is a continuation of the law last year that was added to the act without any debate, as it has been this year to the appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Although the original Broyhill amendment barred those who participated in riots or promoting or carrying on riots, it was changed so that it covered those who were convicted of such crimes. That does not solve the problem. It is still a bill of attainder; it still