

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The statement has been made several times today that the States are being excluded from any authority in developing programs within the State. I think you have been asked whether you would yield that authority. Actually, this legislation does recommend that, where possible, actions flow through the States. Take the States of Illinois and Indiana. Take the Gary-South Chicago area where there is a great deal of poverty there. It is entirely possible that the Director, after consulting with you as a Governor of Indiana and with Governor Kerner of Illinois, may very well decide that the program may be more effective working through a bi-State agency in that area. I imagine there may be instances where we will have tri-State problems. Is that not the purpose of this bill to give the Director that latitude without in any way taking away from you the chief executive's powers?

Governor WELSH. I am sure. And I am sure there will be instances where boys from one State who desperately need this type of assistance will have to be taken to another State to be given this kind of training, either because of facilities or courses or for a number of reasons.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much.

Mr. LANDRUM. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. We will recognize him again in a minute.

The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Governor, I think your testimony is excellent. What you have done, and are trying to do, in the State of Indiana, is a good example of what State government can do in this field. I think that the main argument we are having about this legislation is how to do it; whether or not the Federal Government should provide some incentive for States to do the job where they are not doing it; helping perhaps to finance, to some extent, and to encourage this type of activity.

Your testimony is excellent. You made the statement earlier that the people, the taxpayers, are generally willing to support a program to help young people. I think that is right. I think the programs have to be well conceived, and I think it must be demonstrated to the people that they deserve support. Many times it is much easier to run to Washington rather than justify a program to the local people, and hope that you can get money down here without necessarily convincing the local people that it is a good program.

I think we wind up, then, with a bill here which does not utilize the experience, at least as far as the administration of the program is concerned, of which your program is a good example; this bill speaks in terms of a National Job Corps. The corps shall be composed of male individuals and so forth, "who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director" and so forth. "The Director is authorized in his discretion," if he wants to, "to enter into an agreement with a State or local agency for the provision of such facilities as in his judgment are needed," and so forth.

If State administration is important at all, it seems to me that by endorsing this bill you put an awful lot of blind trust in the bureauc-