

If Congress feels what we have done is not adequate, then I think it is up to Congress to modify the law. We have done everything we know how, anything that the General Counsel has suggested that was constitutional, I have done all I know how to operate an inspection department, and the inspector here is a very distinguished American and an able one, and we have done our best working with the mayors and the community action people, and we have done all we know what to do—in truth, with a thousand community action agencies running across the country, and with thousands of employees, direct and indirect, there have been very, very, very few incidents of the type to which you refer.

Have there been any? Yes, there have been some. But where we got the facts we moved as fast as we could. We have to move constitutionally, too.

Mr. GARDNER. May I say, I think you have given the ideal solution. I think Congress should act.

Mr. SHRIVER. Fine.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It would be my hope that the charges made by the gentleman from North Carolina would be checked out. I believe we have staff members down in Newark and I hope this information could be turned over to them for full information.

We should know exactly who these people are, who they are working for, and what role they have played in this.

Mr. GARDNER. May I say, we have testimony from several people—several of them—

Mr. SHRIVER. Actually, we have that information already. Sometimes it happens in political life. Let's say you are in office and I want to get your job. Sometimes it isn't a riot but a couple of guys fighting over a job.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am very much interested in this, because we have seen in the riots that the first charges made are charges of police brutality. The first thing they do is get people worked up against the police and their alleged brutality, and I think we ought to appreciate the difficult job the police have.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. O'HARA. I think the gentleman from North Carolina has brought up an interesting point on which I can throw some light. The gentleman who made the prediction of blood on the streets may have come from Detroit, because that was a popular expression there at one time.

In 1952 the largest newspaper in Detroit predicted there would be "blood in the streets" if the Democratic candidate, Blair Moody, were elected on the next day.

Whatever else I might think of its opinion in that matter, I don't think the newspaper was trying to incite the people of Detroit to riot and I never even made that accusation, as angry as I was. I think we ought to look at the current problem with a little bit of perspective.

I would like to direct to the chairman a parliamentary inquiry: Did I understand the chairman to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that if he wanted to bring some witnesses from Newark to testify on the involvement of poverty workers in the civil disturbances in Newark that the chairman would hear them tomorrow?

Chairman PERKINS. I made this statement.