

another dispatch on this subject, and I have it here, as a matter of fact.

I will read three sentences out of it:

There will be absolute insistence that every OEO employee and every employee of OEO grantees scrupulously avoid and resist participation by OEO-funded resources in any activities that threaten public order in any community. I shall insist upon immediate and full penalties for any individuals found guilty of wrong behavior in this connection. Furthermore, I shall insist on withholding of funds from any grantee or delegate agencies which is shown to be encouraging or . . .

Chairman PERKINS. The time is up.

Mr. Bell?

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shriver, I want to commend you for a very fine statement. There are not many areas where I find great disagreement with the general thrust of your ideas. However, I may have some differences.

I was in Watts attending hearings about 4 days before the Watts riot occurred. We were in Will Rogers Park and the place was thickly packed. There were over a thousand people there, and they were very, very concerned at that time about the Poverty Act, and about the things that they were not receiving, things that they expected, were hoping for, but with no action by that time.

They weren't essentially blaming you or your organization, perhaps, as much as they were blaming the local organization. My question concerns your communications with your own people; inasmuch as riots happen to be a major problem today. What sort of communications do you maintain between your people as to riots.

Did you have a pretty good idea that the Watts riot was going to take place? Did you have any idea of the problems that existed there at that time?

Mr. SHRIVER. I personally had no idea there was going to be a riot in Watts.

Mr. BELL. Did you have an understanding of the discontent that existed there because of the poverty program?

Mr. SHRIVER. I had the understanding that this discontent had existed in Watts a long time. When people thought there was going to be a war on poverty, people thought somebody from Washington was going to come out, let's say you, and hand out \$10 bills for them.

The concept from the beginning was that it was going to hand out job training and so on. Some people were disappointed that all the chance they got was to go to work. I have been asked, "When is the money going to arrive?"

I had a woman in Omaha in a rally say, "When am I going to get furniture for my house, and shoes for my kids?"

I have been going around the country trying to explain that we are not in a handout program. We are trying to give people a chance to become independent of us, the government—the Los Angeles government or the National Government.

So there is a difference between what we are attempting to do, and what some people thought was going to happen. It is true they are still concerned in Watts, they are concerned in Washington, in Jersey City, in South Bend—not that we haven't handed money out, but even the programs that are running, job training programs, or legal services programs, that those programs are not big enough and they are right.