Mr. PUCINSKI. Could I ask a couple of questions here?

I would like to clear up one point. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana was not aware of this. There is nothing in this bill that establishes $3,000 as the criteria for a poverty-stricken family. This is a policy established both by President Kennedy, President Johnson, and perhaps there were others before that. We, as Americans, having full confidence in the free enterprise and capitalistic system feel that a family that makes less than $3,000 a year within our concept of an economy is an impoverished family. Therefore, we have established this figure of $3,000 as the guideline but it is not a fiixed figure. As a matter of fact, if I may impose on your time for just one second, the Communists had really zeroed in on President Johnson when he announced his program, and particularly Peiping and throughout Asia and Africa they tried to make a great issue of the fact that in America things are so bad that the President had to, himself, personally, declare war on poverty. Well, I am glad that we have a very efficient Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Rowan, who turned right around and went back and replied to the people of Asia and Africa and the rest of the people of the world, "That is true, in America we consider $3,000 a poverty wage." The Chinese, realizing that this was backfiring on them because, as the people of the world began wondering if America considers a person earning $3,000 impoverished, as they looked at their own earnings they concluded things were pretty good in America. So the Communists abandoned their campaign against President Johnson. But the $3,000 figure is not a portion of the act. It is a national goal or standard set by our President. Now the other part I was going to ask you about, section 208 of the bill, there has been some question here as to the protection of the State's voice in provisions of this act. Section 208 provides:

> The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs. Such procedures shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under this title to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate.
>
> The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing tecnical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

You can see in this language a strong desire by the administration to recognize, on the one hand, there may be overlapping jurisdictions where we are dealing in bistate or tristate areas trying to solve a problem of common interest to all of them. But still this act does provide that all applicantions in a given State must be called to the attention of the executive of that State, the Govenor. So he knows at least what is contemplated in the State so that he can then take whatever action he wishes.

Now, do you feel that this language is sufficient or do you have any suggestions on how this language can be strengthened, keeping in mind that this is an area program rather than a centralized program in respective areas? Would this language satisfy you as a Governor that you, as a chief executive, still have sufficient protection against your authority being usurped in this program?

Governor WELSH. I think generally yes, I would be satisfied with this language. My experience has been that the Federal agencies are