

vene a public hearing was indeed unfortunate. It had the desired effect of limiting attendance of community people interested in the inquiry.

Except for a request on November 30, 1965, for information concerning applicants for employment who were not hired by UCC, there has been no other communication with the UCC by the Committee or its investigating staff. It is regrettable that none of the UCC staff were called to testify. Since much of the report relates to Mr. Tyson and his relationship to and control over UCC, it appears most logical that he should have been called to testify on these matters to provide the Committee with direct evidence in the areas of their concern. Failure to call Mr. Tyson, in particular, casts a shadow of doubt and uncertainty on those portions of the report that deal with his relationship to and alleged control over UCC policies and conduct.

It is both unfortunate and improper that some members of the Committee found it necessary, prior to and during the period covering the investigation, to make public statements that "the entire UCC program must get a new base of operation" . . . "some of the revelations we will make will be very startling" . . . and to allege that UCC was dominated by "militant left-wing groups." (*Newark Sunday News*, August 22, 1965). These comments were made before any hearings were convened or evidence assembled. No facts have been offered to support these claims.

The conduct of the Committee members precipitated the fear expressed by the Very Rev. Ledlie I. Laughlin, Jr. Dean of Trinity Episcopal Cathedral and Co-Chairman of the Newark Citizens for Community Action, that the Committee was biased and hostile. (*Newark Evening News*, September 8, 1965). This bias and hostility is borne out by the conduct of the Committee referred to above, and the intemperance reflected in the report.

Despite the statement in the report (page 1) that "the purpose of the investigation was not to impugn the integrity of the men and women who have organized the present private Anti-Poverty Agencies now operating in the City of Newark," the preamble of the text of the report established the contrary. It is replete with unsupported statements of "Financial scandals . . . uncontrolled use of free and easy money . . . jealousies and antagonisms that can embitter the outs for the ins . . . and seeking for political power financed by federal funds . . ." etc. Nowhere in the report is there factual substantiation of such claims. Rather, the report is nonfactual and speculative, replete with claims of we "understand", "surmise" and the like.

The Committee was supplied detailed factual information and data in response to its requests. No effort was made to analyse these documents regarding hiring practices and procedures, salary and related financial information, schedules, program summaries, etc., or to attach them to the report.

Similarly, no effort was made to analyze the testimony of Dean Heckel and Msgr. Dooling, which dealt with the role of the Executive Director, hiring practices, and the conclusions set forth in the report.

The report attached two purported sets of by-laws (Exhibits # 2 and # 3). Exhibit # 2 was a working draft of the by-laws from which the first set of by-laws was adopted by the Corporation in Nov. 1964. Exhibit # 3 had originally been submitted to the Committee on September 8, 1965 pursuant to the Committee's request. However, the Committee was thereafter informed that Exhibit #3 contained errors, and a corrected copy of the by-laws then in effect was provided. (Exhibit VI, Appendix). The Committee report failed to annex the corrected copy of the by-laws to the Appendix herein as Exhibit VII. Moreover, when the Committee published Exhibit #3, it failed to publish the entire last page of the by-laws as submitted on September 8 and predicated part of its case regarding the alleged autocratic authority of the Executive Director upon a document it knew, or should have known, was incorrect. We have annexed to our Appendix, as Exhibit VIII a copy of the last page of the by-laws as originally submitted to the Committee.

These are but some examples of the lack of responsibility demonstrated by the report. It is against this background, against this evident bias and prejudice that we deal with the specific claims in the report.

Synopsis of the committee report

The Committee report concludes ". . . because of the facts, the law, the economics, and general policy considerations" UCC should no longer receive support from the City of Newark, and the "municipality should immediately undertake its own Anti-Poverty Programs."