

long and continuing interest in this area of better communities and improved opportunities for rural Americans. We believe the provisions of this bill are not only consistent with, but are reasonable and proper expansion of the more desirable aspects of the area redevelopment program and the rural areas development programs of the past few years; which programs we have supported and will continue to support.

Under title III, providing special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, we have no substantive change to offer to the committee, but would like to record the opinion that the grant program invites or magnifies the dangers and opportunities for the sort of abuse that may decrease individual responsibility acceptance rather than stimulate incentive and initiative, and this grant program should, therefore, be provided only in very extreme cases, if at all. In making this statement, we recognize that there are instances where grants are the only practical way of relieving some situations and are, therefore, much less expensive than extraordinarily liberal credit.

The language of section 302 seems reasonably adequate. However, to insure initial and substantial reliance on loans of a very liberal sort rather than to resort to grants except in extreme cases, we would suggest that the committee might consider a way of reporting this measure to the House which would add increased emphasis on the importance of having such a program administered with extreme caution or reluctance, to use grants only "if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs"—which, in turn, implies that credits not available on one hand, but that the requirements under this act are such that the grant may be appropriate in combination with, or as a supplement to, other available funds. Clearly, the constant and continuing purpose of administration of this act is to develop responsibility along with opportunity. Without the development of such responsibility and without continuing and adequate regard for the maintenance and improvement of self-respect and individual dignity on the part of the participant, the program cannot serve the purposes outlined in the declaration.

Section 303 of title III appears simply to make available to rural people some of the facilities of Government that have already been available to urban people in meeting the economic problems of similar nature. We would approve this section in general—certainly of its apparent purpose. It appears that the safeguards provided against abuse are adequate. We hope, however, to be able to give further study to the possibility that these provisions might be improved without destroying the intent and purpose for which they were obviously drawn. We offer to hold ourselves in readiness for further consultation with the committee or staff, and we would hope that for a reasonable period of time, we might reserve the opportunity of making further recommendations, as the committee considers this measure.

The program seems clearly to us to offer both practical and effective possibilities of coordinating public agencies in the service of well-designed private programs, such as our own mentioned above. It likewise seems clear that there is a possibility of utilization of public agencies in support of private and non-Government organization programs and efforts to improve communities and broaden opportunities. We wholeheartedly support this philosophy of seeking to intelligently bring resources of Government, local communities, individuals, and organizations into effective and mutually beneficial relationships for the purposes embraced within the declaration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and we pledge the best efforts of the Grange to a continuing effort in community progress through service, improvement, and development, toward improved opportunities, and a better and fuller way of life. It is our hope and belief that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 can and must be made to enhance and increase the value of our efforts and all similarly motivated organizations and individuals.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would just like to point out what, in our judgment, are some of the more pertinent problems and the answers which this legislation suggests.

I would tell you, first of all, that we have no fear of Government at this point. The National Grange probably did more than any other organization in the history of the Nation to put Government in its proper relationship with business in our Nation and in the Grange legislation many years ago. Because we have been in business almost