

Is that correct?

Mr. ADDONIZIO. That is true.

Chairman PERKINS. That is the way I understand the statement so that I cannot understand the relevancy of these other statements.

Mr. THOMPSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his objection.

May I now be recognized?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Bernstein, this borders on the hilarious.

You say that the problem is essentially one of politics, that these people are trying to position themselves for political power in 1970.

It would follow, I suppose, that their ambitions are a threat to whatever ambitions you might have in 1970. Is that a reasonable assertion?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Mr. Thompson, I have no political ambitions in 1970 except to go back into the business world. I think I have had my fill of politics.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are not going to run again?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. I have no intention of running again and I would like to say something else, if I may.

I took my stand on this community action program in the poverty program before I ran for reelection, knowing that I was going to run for reelection and that it could destroy me because I felt an obligation to bring the truth to the people.

Mr. THOMPSON. I admire you for that.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Parliamentary inquiry.

I understood Congressman Gardner had the floor at the time the objections were made. I did not understand he yielded. May I inquire how the gentleman lost the floor without yielding it?

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. QUIE. Could we let Mr. Bernstein finish his statement to find out what he is trying to develop?

Chairman PERKINS. Do we want to operate under the 5-minute rule or 10-minute rule?

What is the sense of the committee?

Mr. GOODELL. I think we could save a lot of time without batting this back and forth if we could set some ground rules. I think what this committee is interested in on both sides of the aisle is any verified or documented facts that you gentlemen can testify to as to involvement of poverty employees in inciting riots, involvement in the riots themselves, or involvement in a way that directly contributed to those riots.

We are not interested in statements about people who are not paid with poverty money and we get way off in right field if we get into this type of thing.

We went through with a statement here, and after a great deal of exchange finally decided, apparently, that the man is not or was not in the poverty program. Perhaps the reason you brought this up is that he has some connection with the poverty program now.

If so, I think it ought to be on the record. Is he or has he ever been in the poverty program?

Mr. ADDONIZIO. He is now.

Mr. GOODELL. Subsequent to this speech, he was hired by the poverty group?