

sideration to at least start to combat this problem. Such has been the case in some of the other programs that I mentioned in my testimony as well as other Federal programs, the accelerated public works, for example; our State and our city has done well because I think there was a serious problem there and these programs were tailored to meet the problems as they existed there.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, under the bill and, as you probably know there is not any allocation at all as far as the States are concerned no assurance that any State or any community will get anything. The allocation of funds is completely within the discretion of the bureaucracy in Washington. The only limitation I know to that statement is that no one State can receive more than 12 percent of the funds.

I think it is a fact that many people do not seem to be too much aware of that. You indicated a certain amount of unhappiness with the understanding and action of the State legislature with respect to the problems of urban areas. But I think we also ought to keep in mind as we consider this legislation that if you are deeply concerned about the problems of Detroit and Michigan that it costs Michigan taxpayers at least a dollar and a quarter for every dollar that they can get back from the Federal Government. That is the most conservative figure that the tax foundation or any other group puts forth.

I also suggest, where do you think the Federal Government is going to get this billion dollars? You have in mind, of course, that we are going to borrow it and that is what you want us to do, but the city of Detroit does not want to borrow money that they need, is that right?

Mayor CAVANAGH. Of course, the city of Detroit has borrowed money. I think every city in the country is probably as near their maximum potential as far as being able to fund some of their own program.

In Michigan, as you know, Congressman, so well, the area which I represent pays in about \$108 per year, yet receives back from our State legislature \$66 a year. So I think this is some slight evidence of sometimes the attitude of our State legislature about urban areas, including even your own city, Traverse City.

My point is that there is a need here and I do not think there is any question about it. When you have 35,000 youngsters walking the streets in just my city alone, and I can't calculate the number in Battle Creek, Muskegon, and Kalamazoo, I am sure there are that many elsewhere in proportion, too, the local government is unable to meet and cope with this problem itself, I think there is a moral responsibility on the part of the Government to involve itself in it. I don't think anyone claims that Government alone can solve the problem. They can't. But the design of this bill is to encourage sort of a community comprehensive approach by private agencies as well. That is what is so interesting and I think salutary about this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman POWELL. The gentleman from California, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Mayor, I am delighted to have had the opportunity of hearing your excellent statement.

The main thrust of the opposition witnesses so far and somewhat the questioning of my friends on the other side of the table has been that the Vocational Education Act and the Manpower Development and Retraining Act, if we would just give them more time to work