

The National Federation of Settlements has 246 member agencies and services 16 more, operating 399 neighborhood centers in 94 cities, 30 states and the District of Columbia. 22 metropolitan or regional federations of neighborhood centers are affiliates, too. In addition, NFS operates a National Training Center, based in Chicago. NFS works nationally for neighborhood conditions favorable to family life and helps its member centers to serve their neighborhoods effectively through a wide range of direct and advisory services. Most of our member centers are engaged in anti-poverty programs and have been over many years. Currently, in addition to their voluntarily funded efforts, they administer some \$40 million in OEO funds. The National Federation of Settlements reaffirms its continuing support of an effective Economic Opportunity Act, in the full context of the Declaration of Purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It advanced as the goal of our nation the elimination of "the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty—by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity."

We submit that the bill now before you, while incorporating some excellent amendments, falls too far short of this ideal. It seems to us to be more oriented toward quieting some of the critics of this essential federal program than toward improving the charter for the programs it will help fund.

We endorse the evident intent of the bill that there be no dismantlement of the Office of Economic Opportunity and no further delegations of programs, at this time, to other federal departments for administration. We support the concept of OEO as an arm of the Executive Office of the President.

We shall limit our testimony, in the main, to those titles and sections of the bill which, we believe, need revision.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

We endorse an increase in OEO funding, but believe the amount proposed, \$2.06 billion, still falls far short of adequate funding.

The field investigations of this Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty have served to underscore the crisis confronting poor people in Mississippi. But there are crises resulting from poverty in all parts of our country, North, South, East and West, rural, urban and suburban.

The Administration request for federal FY 1967 does not measure up to those critical needs, nor does it measure up to the conservative projections of expansion originally outlined by the Office of Economic Opportunity. OEO said, in 1964, that overall expenditures in its third year of operation would be at least \$3.5 billion. And this was said before the adoption, in subsequent years, of such worthwhile provisions as the Nelson, Scheuer, Kennedy and Javits amendments.

Further, the 1967 amendments provide for a justifiable expansion of attacks on rural poverty. To fund these adequately within the limits of a \$2.06 billion authorization, and with earmarking of a significant proportion of Title II funds, would most likely result in a freeze or further cuts in versatile urban CAP funding beyond those occasioned by inadequate funding in FY 1966.

NFS therefore urges a doubling of OEO authorization and appropriation from \$2.06 billion to \$4 billion for federal FY 1967.

JOB CORPS

T.H. 1A, Section 105, Screening and Selection (of applicants)—Special Limitations, tampers with, if it does not completely destroy the original intent of the Job Corps, a service for youth handicapped in their own community by reason of previous behavior or "label." These are youth who are most in need of a properly conducted residential setting if they are to have any chance of "making it."

Further, this Section is well nigh impossible to administer. It asks that the screening agent make projections as to future behavior of all individual applicants as well as ruling out all youth with a record of "behavioral aberrations." Those of us who have worked with delinquent youth know that motivation for change in behavior comes at different periods for each youth. We have found many a "late bloomer," who despite a record of repetitive delinquent acts is indeed ready for rehabilitative help. Section 105 would deny such youth the Job Corps as a new opportunity for breaking away from the delinquent behavior pattern.

Criteria for screening out so-called undesirable Job Corps applicants can only result in "creaming" the best of the youth and refusing service to many who are most in need of a residential service outside their own neighborhood. We therefore recommend that Section 105, Title I, be deleted.