

tolerant of Communist-oriented groups posed a quite different problem from that in Venezuela. Different again is the situation in Chile, where a Communist-Socialist coalition seeks power through regular elections to be held later this year. Methods of combating Communist infiltration must be adapted to the situation.

Subversion from abroad remains a major aspect of the Communist threat to many Latin American countries, particularly those in the Caribbean—and the principal source of this subversion continues to be Castro's Cuba. The case of Venezuela today, as for many other Latin American neighbors, the Castro government in Cuba is not a nuisance to be ignored but a menace to be eliminated. Communist subversion from Cuba is not a "myth" to be exposed but an ever-present reality to be faced.

The report issued in February of this year by the Organization of American States makes it indisputably clear that Cuba has smuggled arms to terrorists in Venezuela. There is now photographic evidence of the plan and plot to subvert the Betancourt government at the time of the election last December.

What should the U.S. position be in such cases? Our national policy should be one of clear, unequivocal support for taking the necessary steps to cut off arms shipments from Cuba to Venezuela or any other Latin American nation. Cuba must not be permitted to be an arsenal for terrorism, revolution, and chaos. Instead of merely worrying about governments of friendly countries being able to stay in power and resist violence, we should choke off the source of that violence.

I believe that we should wholeheartedly support the position of the Venezuelan Government in the OAS, where it has requested joint sanctions against Cuba. I hope that the required action can be accomplished within the framework of the OAS. But if it cannot, this should not mean that we will permit friendly governments like that in Venezuela to remain defenseless because of the inaction of its neighbors. The existing machinery of the OAS should not be permitted to impede the successful handling of problems of this sort.

There may be instances where it is actually preferable to take bilateral action to meet a Communist threat rather than require the participation or approval of all members of the OAS. An effective response to Communist subversion does not always require that all Latin American governments publicly and officially take a strong positive position. Undue pressure to do so may sometimes be counterproductive, by weakening the political position of a government which is fundamentally anti-Communist but whose freedom of action is restricted by a delicate balance of internal political force. The machinery of the OAS should be sufficiently flexible to permit bilateral action as well as multilateral action where it may be required.

I do not favor a military invasion of Cuba. Even less do I favor so great a preoccupation with Cuba that all other hemispheric issues are ignored. But so long as the stated purpose of the Castro régime is to export its Communist revolution, it will remain a threat to many Latin American governments. So long as it remains a threat to them, it remains much more than a nuisance to the United States. For our own interests are inextricably bound up with those of our neighbors in the hemisphere.

#### IV

In implementing the policy outlined above it should be understood that methods must vary from country to country, that U.S. ac-

tion in implementing the Alliance for Progress is dependent upon the actions of Latin American countries. For the immediate future I would mention several lines of action which might be effective in realizing our objectives. If rapid progress is to be made in achieving the social and economic objectives of the Alliance for Progress, it will require in the next decade both greater mobilization of resources by Latin American governments and a larger infusion of external resources. These external resources will come chiefly from three sources: (1) aid from foreign governments, and international lending agencies; (2) trade; and (3) foreign private investment.

All three of these are essential to most Latin American countries and will continue to be for the foreseeable future. In the face of continued congressional criticism of foreign aid and disappointment abroad with the volume of aid and the conditions attached to it, there has been a tendency to disparage foreign aid; Latin Americans look to trade and North Americans to private investment as a substitute.

Trade brings into a country needed foreign exchange, but it carries with it no guarantee that the foreign exchange will be used for purposes having a high priority in the development of an economy or society. The exchange usually goes to a relatively few people in the commercial sector and, in the absence of effective progressive tax systems or exchange controls, can be spent on luxury items or sent abroad to foreign banks. Foreign aid not only brings in needed capital but capital that can be easily channeled into those projects and those sectors of society deemed of crucial importance.

Foreign private investment—as many previously skeptical Latin Americans have now learned after experimenting with swollen, inefficient state business corporations—is absolutely essential both to increase the productivity of a country and to develop an efficient industrial and agricultural sector. With the strong encouragement of the U.S. Government—for example, through investment guarantees and tax credits—American business can continue to provide leadership in building a strong private sector in Latin American countries. But it is a mistake to claim too much for private investment, to ignore the necessity of expending large sums on the economic and social infrastructure (highways, ports, dams, schools, and health systems) which can be financed only by public funds.

All three—aid, trade, and private investment—are essential to social and economic progress in Latin America. In my view, we in the United States do not allocate the amount of resources to Latin America required to do the job that needs to be done. Although Latin American countries may be less capable of absorbing large amounts of capital than were the European countries under the Marshall plan, it is nevertheless true that our contribution to the Alliance for Progress is pitifully small compared to the billions of dollars—mostly in grants, not loans—that we poured into Europe after the Second World War. In line with the priority which we should assign to Latin America in our global policy considerations, our aid to this area should be substantially increased for the rest of the decade.

There is no reason, however, why the increased aid to Latin America should come exclusively from the United States. It should be recognized that the European contribution to Latin America need not be limited to respecting embargoes on trade with Cuba. European countries—together with other countries like Japan and Canada that conduct substantial trade with the area—should be strongly encouraged to contribute to the infusion of capital that is required, and on

terms that are favorable. This assistance should represent private investment as well as Government aid.

Trade may not be a panacea for the problems of Latin America, but it now seems clear that we must give greater attention to developing trade within this hemisphere. The terms of trade for Latin American countries have remained unstable. Although commodity prices have shot upward during the past year, it is unclear whether this is a temporary improvement or a long-range trend. Trade among Latin American countries has not flourished, with the exception of the recently established Central American Common Market. Our exports to Latin America have leveled off, and it is clear that we shall face increasing competition there with Europe and Japan.

It is too early to say exactly what regional mechanisms should be used to bring about increased trade between the United States and Latin America, to promote competition and stable trade relations within the hemisphere. The brief experience of the Central American Common Market indicates what can be achieved in a limited area if individual countries are willing to look beyond their borders. The experience with LAFTA—Latin American Free Trade Area—thus far is less promising. Certainly, one of the problems which should be given early consideration by the newly created Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress and by the Inter-American Development Bank is the possibility of giving greater impetus to the regional movement in the LAFTA countries. The Inter-American Development Bank has begun to finance the acceleration of regional trade within LAFTA, and its efforts should be supplemented.

As for the United States, I believe that we must soon undertake an intensive review of our hemispheric trade policy. Trade is essential to the economic prosperity of the hemisphere and we should give careful consideration to the possibility of developing a more cohesive trading area, which would not only bring economic advantages but would also promote the political unity of the hemisphere.

The next step in promoting a hemispheric trade zone might be to lend our strong support to the development of LAFTA in the same way that we gave our backing to the Common Market in Europe and to the Central American Common Market. We should promote the creation of new exports and the expansion of existing exports by supplementing the funds now available for this purpose from the IDB. We should participate in planning LAFTA's development and encourage American business to do likewise. Once LAFTA has made significant progress, we can then consider what new trade relationships should be developed between the LAFTA area and the United States and Canada.

In the future, decisions on questions of basic importance to the development of the Alliance for Progress, such as those on aid and trade, should naturally be made through the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Just as the U.S. Government has improved its machinery for handling hemispheric affairs, so the members of the Alliance have created a mechanism to facilitate truly multilateral decision-making on hemispheric problems. But this new organ can succeed only to the extent that it has the strong support of the nations of the hemisphere, especially the United States. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has indicated the strong congressional sentiment in favor of multilateralism, thereby giving the executive branch the freedom it needs to assist in acceleration of the trend from unilateral to multilateral decision-making under the Alliance for Progress.

In pursuing the political objectives of the Alliance for Progress—both the positive aim

of inspiring a commitment to constitutional government and democratic institutions and the negative objective of thwarting Communist expansion—we would do well to divert more attention and resources to programs in the educational, ideological, cultural, and propaganda fields. We should expand programs aimed both at the elite and at the popular classes. According to the best information available to me, approximately 8,000 Brazilians were brought to the United States during the past 10 years under our various educational and cultural exchange programs. If we really appreciated the revolutionary atmosphere in Latin America today and understood the nature of the Communist appeal to younger people who will become the elite of their societies, we would raise this figure to 3,000 per year.

Similarly we should use all possible leverage to encourage Latin American governments to expend the resources needed to wipe out illiteracy among the mass of the people. Where the determination exists, illiteracy can be effectively eliminated in a brief period, a fact that has been proven by the Castro government in Cuba. Of the many reasons which could be advanced in support of crash programs to end illiteracy, I will cite only three: First, active popular participation in political life under a democratic government is impossible if half the population cannot read and write. Second, historically no society that has succeeded in abolishing illiteracy has remain poor for long. Third, the balanced population growth rate that will be necessary in the future is not likely to be accomplished while half the population remains illiterate.

In our efforts to cooperate with Latin Americans in realizing the objectives of the Alliance, we should be aware of the renaissance of one of the traditional institutions found in all Latin American societies—the Roman Catholic Church. One of the most encouraging trends of the past decade has been the new awakening on the part of church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent, and the new determination to meet those problems now through fundamental reforms.

Today in Chile, Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina and Colombia members of the hierarchy are actively pushing the reforms stipulated under the Alliance Charter. Whereas formerly the active espousal of progressive social and economic policies was largely confined to religious orders like the Maryknoll priests or to isolated pastors, today they are supported by occupants of metropolitan sees. The farsighted social and economic philosophy of the late Pope John's social encyclicals *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been "promoted" to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals.

The church's role is important not only in promoting economic and social reform, but also in building free societies and encouraging hemispheric unity. The building of a just economic and social order requires the rapid modification—sometimes the destruction—of old institutions. In a revolutionary era, the temptation is great for the state to absorb total responsibility in the social and economic order, to eliminate all institutions which it cannot directly control itself, to create an atomized society. History teaches us—and the recent example of Cuba reminds us once again—that it is the atomized society that is easy prey for totalitarian government. In one of the best capsule definitions of totalitarian government, Hannah Arendt once defined it as the elimination of all subgroups between the individual and the state. During the next decade, when revolutionary change will be the order of the day in many countries, there may be times when a brake

is needed on the action of the state if social pluralism and individual political liberty are to be preserved. In some Latin American countries, it may be the church that will be called upon to play that role.

Finally, the Catholic Church—together with Roman law and the Spanish language—is one of the principal unifying forces in this vast continent. In an age of rampant nationalism, the common bond which the church provides may have a powerful impact in overcoming the separatist tendencies of the age and in achieving hemispheric unity.

In conclusion, I would emphasize that quite apart from the specific programs which we may support in implementing our policy in Latin America—programs of aid, trade, private investment, education, or propaganda—what is equally important is our success in solving our own preeminent social problem—achieving equality for the Negro—and our attitude toward our fellow citizens in the hemisphere. In a continent where the large majority of people are nonwhite, a continent that includes societies like Brazil which have developed a harmonious multiracial society, it is hard to exaggerate the importance which people attach to our efforts to extend the benefits of modern civilization to the Negro minority in the United States, just as Latin American countries are striving to make them available to the majority of their own people.

President Kennedy is revered for opening up a new era in relations between the United States and Latin America, not primarily because he promised material assistance, but because he conveyed an understanding and respect for Latin American people, for their culture, and many of their traditions. He did not regard Latin American people as inferior or expect them to see the solution to their own problems in blind imitation of the United States. It is this attitude of understanding and respect that must permeate not only our leadership, but our entire society. This will not be easy to accomplish—as most adults in this country were educated in schools where the overwhelming majority of textbooks and reference books either ignored Latin America or reflected a condescending attitude toward Latin Americans. Written chiefly by authors sympathetic to a northern European cultural inheritance, which historically has been fundamentally unsympathetic to Latin culture, these books have been all too important an influence in shaping the attitude of generations of Americans. Change in popular attitudes comes slowly. A full appreciation of the importance of Latin America will come only when our educational system begins to reflect the priority stated by President Kennedy when he described Latin America as the most critical area in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I appreciate them.

#### POLICE MISHANDLING OF CUBAN REFUGEE DEMONSTRATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I believe that all of us were sickened and dismayed by the photographs in this morning's papers which showed Cuban refugees, who had come to Washington to demonstrate for the freedom of their country being pushed around and chased by our mounted police. Here were people whose objectives accorded with the expressed policy of the United States, and who were by every standard entitled to our sympathy and consideration. And yet they were treated like enemies or subversives rather than like friends.

Whatever the reason for the clash be-

tween the Cuban refugees and the Washington police force, I consider yesterday's events to be most unfortunate because they could only have served to create the impression that Washington is unsympathetic to the anti-Castro refugees and what they stand for. I know that this is not the case. But sometimes the impression created by the clumsy handling of a situation such as this can count for more than the actual facts.

Inevitably, there are conflicting accounts about what happened.

Originally, I had planned to attend the demonstration in front of the Lincoln Memorial by way of manifesting my personal sympathy with the objectives of the demonstration. Because it proved impossible for me to break away from my Senate work, I sent along an aid to represent me and to greet the large delegation from Connecticut on my behalf.

My assistant, who was on the scene at the time of the disturbance, was informed by refugee leaders that the trouble began when the police ruled that they could not approach within 500 feet of the Pan American Building premises. To some of the refugees this restriction appeared arbitrary and intolerable. They had come to Washington from faraway points for the purpose of letting the delegates to the meeting of the OAS know how strongly they felt about the Castro tyranny and for the purpose of urging the OAS to take affirmative action for the liberation of Cuba. They knew, because they have seen these photographs in their newspapers, that pacifists and Communists and American Nazi Party members are permitted to demonstrate right up against the railings that surround the White House grounds. They felt—and I believe quite rightly—that they should be permitted to stage their own demonstration at least within sight of the Pan American Building and the OAS delegates. When they were denied permission to do so, some of them attempted to break through the police lines.

Anyone who has been in Washington during the last few years knows that such demonstrations go on all the time. I am not suggesting that they should go on, but I think that there should be an evenhanded rule about all demonstrations. I cannot understand the policy that lets the Communists and the Nazis demonstrate on the sidewalks in front of the White House and tries to put our friends, the Cuban refugees—5,000 of them—about two blocks away from the Pan American Building.

At this point, the police apparently decided to break up the demonstration completely. There is no evidence that the police actually used their clubs on the refugees. But all accounts are agreed that mounted police, and police on motorcycles and on foot, charged into the crowd swinging their clubs demonstratively.

The Baltimore Sun reported that when the first group of refugees attempted to force their way to the Pan American Building, a squad of mounted police charged into the demonstrators at full

gallop, rather than pressing their horses against them. According to the Sun, the horses bowled the demonstrators over like teppins, and one woman was cut by a flying hoof.

The Washington Post reported that all told some 45 refugees were injured. My assistant informed me that the police continued to pursue the demonstrators far to the rear of the Navy Building, several hundred yards away from the Pan American Building.

The Washington police force has earned an enviable reputation for its ability to handle demonstrations of all hues without incident. In dealing with Nazis and Communists as well as with democratic critics of various Government policies, they have displayed restraint and tact and understanding. It is most unfortunate that their reputation for dealing with crowds should have suffered its first major lapse in dealing with the refugees from Communist Cuba.

I have heard that the police were under rigid instructions to keep the demonstrators more than 500 feet away from the Pan-American Building. There is, it is true, a District of Columbia statute that empowers the police to take such action. But this is a statute that has in the past been very flexibly interpreted. After all, as I have said, hardly a week goes by without some kind of demonstration on the sidewalks of Pennsylvania Avenue only a few feet removed from the White House grounds.

In the case of yesterday's demonstration in particular, I think the police should have been guided by flexibility rather than rigidity. The demonstrators were not there to assault the OAS. They simply wanted the delegates to the OAS to see them. I am certain that they would have been satisfied if the police had permitted them to demonstrate in the park across from the Pan-American Building. Unfortunately, this was not done. The result was the distressing photographs and stories which appeared in this morning's newspapers.

I feel that the Washington police, by this action, have tarnished their reputation for tact and restraint in the handling of demonstrators. I do not know whether this was due to bungling at police level or to orders from a higher level. But it is a sorry situation when people who come to Washington to demonstrate for the freedom of Cuba are pushed around in this manner.

I am asking the Washington Police Department and the Cuban refugee leaders for their respective accounts of yesterday's events. I am also asking the State Department whether it issued any instructions relative to the handling of yesterday's demonstration. If the evidence indicates the need for further clarification, I intend to ask for a formal investigation for the purpose of establishing the facts.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Na-

tion to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that such additional staff members as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may find necessary to have present in the Chamber may be authorized to have the privilege of the floor during consideration of the bill (S. 2642).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am privileged to bring before the Senate the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and to urge its approval.

Today in America we are confronted by a strange paradox: We have serious poverty in the midst of plenty.

As a nation, our standard of living has never been higher. Our personal income, gross national product, and employment have never been higher. Total unemployment and the cost of living, in the face of a rapidly increasing population, have held the line.

Yet, as we go behind the glittering showcase of our booming national economy and probe beneath the sense of well-being and even complacency enjoyed by so many Americans, we find a disturbing situation.

We find millions of Americans whose economic, educational, and social conditions are such that they can only be classed as poverty stricken.

These are the hidden Americans.

There was a time in our Nation's history when the wealthy were the hidden Americans—purposely isolated in their walled estates, country clubs, and a closed society from the great majority of our citizens.

But as our standard of living has increased—as more and more persons are able to enjoy the pleasures of leisure and of material comfort that higher income and living standards provide—such artificial barriers have tumbled.

And as the general standard of living has increased, those at the bottom of the economic scale have tended to become the hidden Americans.

They are hidden in the welter of statistics which show our employment and economy at the highest levels in history.

They are hidden because they have exhausted their unemployment compensation and are no longer counted in that category.

They are hidden on the farms and in rural areas where more than 4 million families struggle along on less than \$250 a month.

They are hidden in the slums of the cities, carefully screened off from the business and residential areas.

They are hidden because too much of America does not want to see them.

But they are there.

They are born, they live, they try, and too often they die in the same circumstances of abject poverty into which they were born.

It is this condition of poverty—poverty in the midst of plenty—that the legislation now before us is intended to attack.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, proposed by President Johnson and

now spelled out in S. 2642 as approved by your committee, is not a welfare program.

It is not a program of handouts aimed at merely helping people to continue to exist.

It is a program whose goal is to help permanently correct the conditions under which poverty lives and breeds.

There is, of course, more to poverty than starvation and squalid slums.

There is the poverty of low income, the poverty of underemployment, and the poverty of being an older worker whose abilities have been bypassed by technological advances.

There is the poverty of despair, as the individual sees little or no chance of improving his circumstances in his lifetime. He walks on a treadmill of hopelessness and passes on this heritage of hopelessness to his children.

Through this legislation we intend to replace this feeling of no hope with new hope.

We intend to help people break out of the disastrous rut dug by their environment.

The rewards will be great.

In addition to helping to lift individuals and their families from the personal degradation and desperation of poverty, we will be strengthening our national economy.

As President Johnson said in his message to the Congress on this program:

If we can raise the average earnings of 10 million among the poor by only \$1,000 we will have added \$14 billion a year to our national output. In addition we can make important reductions in public assistance payments which now cost us \$4 billion a year, and in the large costs of fighting crime and delinquency, disease and hunger.

No one pretends that this legislation before us will fully solve the problems of poverty.

But it is a start. However, as President Johnson pointed out, it is more than a beginning. It is a commitment that this Nation will use its resources to achieve victory over this enemy.

S. 2642 proposes programs which, during the first year of the war on poverty, will expand opportunities for young men and women to gain the education, skills, and experience they must have to become full participants in our society and stable parents in years to come; stimulate our communities to initiate local action programs to attack the roots of poverty; help rural families now destitute to increase their income through a program of small capital grants and loans; provide a sounder base for the rehabilitation of poor areas of our great cities by expanding small business activities; provide special programs for undereducated adults and migratory agricultural workers; encourage more States to use public assistance as an instrument for helping families lift themselves out of poverty; recruit and train volunteers who will help carry out the war on poverty.

Just as space and other imaginative programs pay hidden dividends, so the war on poverty will pay immediate monetary returns.

The visible cost of not adopting this program, in terms of direct public as-

16056

stance payments alone, is \$5 billion per year.

In addition to these direct payments, the indirect costs of poverty to this country which show up in juvenile delinquency, crime, health hazards, and higher police and fire protection take billions more.

This bill adopts a coordinated approach because poverty has multiple causes:

Title I of the bill concentrates on problems of youth, and especially on the problem of the youth trying to get the skills with which he can find a decent job.

Title II concentrates on poor communities and will stimulate and help them to undertake, through the efforts of local government and organizations and local people, concrete programs to attack local causes of poverty, whether they be inadequate education, poor health care, dilapidated housing, or insufficient family services.

Title III of the bill concentrates on rural families, where the most destitute of the Nation's poor are found.

Title IV concentrates on small business, which is so essential to employment opportunities in parts of our great cities.

Title V concentrates on helping the public assistance recipient, and other needy persons, develop new skills which will make them employable.

Under title I are three youth programs designed to create new opportunities and to expand the existing opportunities for young people to obtain work, education, and training.

Part A of title I authorizes the establishment of a Job Corps to prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of citizenship and employment.

The Job Corps is designed to serve the needs of hundreds of thousands of rural and urban young Americans who are out of school and out of work or who are employed in dead-end jobs.

The Job Corps will seek to enroll those young persons, age 16 through 21, for whom the best prescription is a change in surroundings and associations.

Individuals who have not been graduated from an accredited high school may be enrolled only when further attendance is any regular academic vocational or training program is impractical.

To those who volunteer and are selected, the Job Corps will offer a rewarding opportunity for education, vocational training, useful work, recreation and physical training, and other appropriate activities welded into a carefully designed program.

Enrollees in the Job Corps will live in either conservation or training centers in rural or urban areas.

Both will be residential.

The conservation centers of approximately 100 to 200 volunteers each will offer a healthy out-of-doors life where the discipline of work and new skills will be learned, while our Nation's parks, forests, and other natural resources are improved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will the annual cost per enrollee in the Job Corps be?

Mr. McNAMARA. The figures for the total cost of the bill are on each Senator's desk. I shall come to finances later in the speech, if the Senator will allow me to continue. We have the figures. I shall be glad to give the Senator the figures later.

The training centers will be larger, and many will use excess Government facilities.

Voluntary leadership on the part of enrollees in the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—program will play an important role in Job Corps centers.

The work-training programs in title I, part B, are designed to give employed young men and women aged 16 to 21—including both those in school and those out of school—a chance to break out of poverty.

It would provide them with an opportunity to work and to give them a training experience not now available to them in private employment or under any existing Federal program.

It is anticipated that the administration of this part will give particular attention to work programs which will enable young people to maintain regular high school attendance or return to high school if they have already dropped out.

The work offered young men and women in this program will increase their employability by enabling them to acquire new work habits on a job.

Attention will also be given to counseling during, and job placement after, the work training period.

Programs under the training scheme can only be sponsored by State or local public agencies or by private nonprofit agencies.

The kinds of jobs on which the young people will work are varied.

They may work in occupations for which there is a greatly increased demand in the public and the private nonprofit sectors, such as auto mechanics, office workers, draftsmen trainees, cook's assistants, nurse's aids, and hospital orderlies.

They may also be employed in occupations related to the development of recreation facilities, the conservation of natural resources and neighborhood improvement projects.

All of the jobs will provide important services and should be designed to increase the employability of the youth.

In no instances will the youth thus employed replace others already now employed.

College work-study programs authorized under title I, part C, are designed to provide basic financial assistance through part-time employment for the able but needy college student, or potential college student.

The Director will coordinate these programs with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Execution of the programs will be the responsibility of the participating institution of higher learning.

Many more able students from poor families would be able to enter any complete college, if they could depend on part-time work during the college year, and full-time employment during vacation periods to supplement limited loan

or scholarship support from the college or university itself.

Under authorizations proposed in this part, part-time and vacationtime work opportunities would be provided for more than 140,000 students from low-income families per year.

Federal funds will be distributed among States according to a three-factor formula: the full-time college enrollment—the number of high school graduates—and number of children 18 years and under from families with incomes under \$3,000 per year in each State as compared with the national total.

Each participating institution will be encouraged to develop two types of employment opportunities: on-campus employment in a wide variety of occupations, and off-campus employment under agreement with public or nonprofit organizations.

In this way the college can help meet the financial needs of the student, the student gains valuable work experience, and the community gains talented and highly motivated student assistance in a variety of service jobs.

In addition to being enrolled or accepted for enrollment in an institution of higher education, the student must come from a low-income family and be in need of financial assistance.

S. 2642 recognizes that the war against poverty, while a national effort, must be carried out through action in the community.

Title II emphasizes the role of the local organization in developing, as well as conducting, the action program.

This legislation sees the role of the Federal Government as providing counsel and help, upon request of local community organizations.

It is based on the belief that local citizens know and understand their communities best, and that sustained and vigorous leadership can only come from them.

Because of the diverse nature of the poverty problem in widespread communities, as much flexibility as possible will be left to community civic and local organizations.

A basic criterion, however, is that the programs receiving Federal support must not treat the poverty condition symptomatically, but must attack the root of the problem in a way that promises a final solution.

The organizations engaged in these community action projects may be public or nonprofit private agencies, or a combination of the two.

Participation by the widest range of community organizations will be encouraged, provided, of course, that the programs they offer are available without discrimination throughout the community.

Settlement houses, citizens' associations, YMCA's and YWCA's, parents' organizations, labor unions, chambers of commerce, and similar organizations are examples.

The second part of title II is a basic education program for adults, which provides for grants to States to provide literacy and other elemental training.