

(Called to Ida Mae)

WASHINGTON, D. C.  
September 29, 1966

For Immediate Release

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kans) was unsuccessful in his effort to amend the Poverty Program to prohibit use of poverty funds to pay attorney fees in divorce, separate maintenance, and annulment actions. Dole explained that an experimental program called "Judicare" was recently initiated by the Office of Economic Opportunity with a \$240,000 grant to 26 northern Wisconsin counties.

During the first six weeks of the program, designed to protect the poor against unfair housing, unfair welfare, credit and consumer practices, there were 86 cases filed; however, 72 of them were divorce matters. The federal government in effect created a "slush" fund in the poverty program for lawyers. This is another federal handout which sounds good in theory, but proves otherwise in practice.

Under the Poverty Program, billions of taxpayers' money is expended to help the poor and to keep families together. At the same time, and under the same program, family separation is subsidized by underwriting attorney fees in divorce, separation and annulment cases for beneficiaries of the program.

"The Poverty Program is riddled with one example after another of waste and maladministration -- but none worse than this one," Dole said.

-2-

university facilities, to provide student aids, and to assist State and local authorities in improving education, especially for the lower income segment of society. A limited number of teachers are provided fellowships and scholarships by the Federal Government, such as the Fulbright and National Science Foundation programs. The great majority of teachers not only find these fellowships unavailable, but must finance programs to improve their competency from their own meager resources. In order to improve educational quality, there must be a national policy that will encourage people to enter, remain and advance in the teaching profession.

"The best possible way to achieve this objective," Dole concluded, "without the slightest vestige of Federal control, is to encourage those who teach to continue to upgrade their competency through individual effort. Thus, I feel it is imperative the Congress provide for tax deduction of teachers' educational expenses --- before the 89th Congress adjourns."

would virtually eliminate the small gains which had been made to provide tax justice for teachers. As a result of these discriminatory proposed regulations, a great number of Congressmen voiced strong objections, and many introduced remedial legislation. As a result, the Revenue Service withdrew its proposed regulations on October 1, 1966, and issued a revised proposal. The revised proposal, at first glance, appeared to provide some relief, but after careful study, it is obvious it contains numerous serious discrepancies which would, in effect, deprive members of the teaching profession, and other taxpayers who pursue additional education in connection with their employment in profession, of the benefits of my proposal and other similar pending measures.

In addition to the legal aspects of the situation, Congressman Dole indicated other factors were worthy of consideration. "First, as the National Education Association points out, teachers cannot, in all fairness, be treated in the same manner as self-employed professionals or businessmen. They are in public service and are employed by non-profit schools and colleges. They are inspired to continuously improve and update their knowledge because of dedication to a teaching career. Increasing costs of higher education are discouraging this very commendable practice, and thus the Federal Government should encourage teachers to improve themselves for the benefit of those they teach.

"Secondly, we have a severe shortage of teachers at all education levels. Congress has enacted important and far-reaching programs to improve college and