

one of those who does not endorse the simplistic explanation of the riots. I recognize that in many areas, poverty workers, along with all other citizens of the area interested in preserving peace have worked very hard in stifling the riots.

There are questions at times about people involved in the poverty program, not inciting people to riot, but rubbing raw situations in the community over a long period of time.

I know the allegation has been made that this has been going on for 2 months, 7 days a week, with poverty workers involved in this, so although poverty workers might not be exciting people directly to riot, if they are rubbing all the nerves raw, and creating circumstances for riots to break out, we would be concerned about it.

I think we should be given the facts on it. Many a child has lit a match and seen a holocaust go up and stood back and gasped at what happened. He didn't intend for it to happen.

There is another aspect of this which concerns me. You talked about social dynamite, which I agree it is, and you talk about discontent, which I agree exists. The discontent is many sided.

I am, for instance, very much aware of the discontent with an inadequate program, and discontent over big money going to social planners and the people not seeing it themselves—discontent, big sales jobs, with few results.

All of these things are not particularly calculated to preserve the peace in a community. There is a coincidence, and I don't believe there is a casual relation obviously, but we have had riots breaking out in this country in the last 3 years. It happens to be coincidental with the war on poverty, and in this period, as the President said the other night, we have put more money into social action programs and into our urban areas than in any other 3-year period in our history.

These things concern us. I am one of those who refuses to say we should stop doing anything. Obviously these are symbols of failure, but I don't think it is adequate to say we should pour more money into the same old ways of solving things.

Money is not going to solve it without new directions.

Let me ask you this. We have had a great deal of discussion about rat eradication. Under the Public Health Service, the Public Health Act of 1966, there was \$62.5 million, which was a program for which applications would be received for rat eradication. This point was brought out by Congressman Henry Reuss, when he opposed the rat eradication bill on the floor of the House a few weeks ago.

He said, "Why do we need another grant-in-aid program?"

Do we really solve more by having two or three Federal agencies fund these things than we would if we put enough money into a single program in the Federal Government?

I ask you this question, is it not true that rat eradication is one of the programs eligible for community action funds?

Mr. SHRIVER. The only rat eradication program in America is in Chicago—excuse me a second. We put about \$2.5 million into it. We did not use community action unearmarked funds. We used the 207 money, demonstration money, because it was the only money we could utilize, the only money we could get our hands on.

It is true if a city wanted not to have the head start program or