

run the business. I am the man; within our legal charter, there are certain restrictions as to what as president I can do and what the board of directors can do. Sometimes our shareholders seem to think that the board of directors and the president might deviate somewhat from what the charter or what they have said we can do. At that time they have a right to express their opinion and, believe me, they unequivocally do.

It seems to me you have to have a government both of laws and of men but that the primary consideration of responsibility has to be upon the man who operates within the framework of the laws.

Let me be specific. We presently are building a very large central city redevelopment downstate. This involves many millions of dollars. This was discussed in general with our shareholders and it was approved by them. It has been discussed specifically with our board of directors and it has been approved by them. But the basic administration within the framework which has been set up by our board has to be operated by Martin, and I have to be responsible.

Now, there are rules and there are laws. But regardless of the laws or rules that are laid down by government or by business, it still depends on the quality of the administration that you have to run those.

So I say, in answer to you, on a principle you have to have both government within business and within public affairs, by laws and also by men. I believe in both.

Mr. GRIFFIN. You are satisfied that this bill lays down sufficient guidelines and criteria so that we will have government by law, as well as of men, under this bill, I take it?

Mr. V. MARTIN. I would assume you would be the same as our own board of directors, that if there is not specific detail in here that later has to be developed and spelled out, that this would be done. This is done with me as a business executive every month of the year. Where we have broad rules—

Mr. GRIFFIN. We have had a lot of witnesses who come in and say they are against poverty, that they are for the principles of the bill but then say, in effect, "I do not want to be concerned about the language and the detail of the bill; that is up to you." I do not think that is quite meeting the responsibility of testifying on a piece of legislation because—

Mr. V. MARTIN. I would simply like to comment on that. When you come into our store to buy something, I don't expect you know how to write the order or ring up the cash register. I am going to sell it to you. I am not a specialist in government; you are. This is good because there has to be specialist in government, there have to be specialists in business. All I will say to you is that the country needs to buy an antipoverty program.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If we pass this bill just the way it is, that is fine with you?

Mr. V. MARTIN. You are asking me a question on specifics just as if I would ask you now, do you want me to write this order and place it with Hart, Schaffner & Marx, or Kuppenheimer's. I can't ask you that. Nor can you ask me if I am satisfied with this bill. I am not a lawmaker. I am satisfied with the general purpose of the bill. I have read this through rather thoroughly. I am bewildered by cer-