

While I agree with everything that you want to do for this particular group of people, yet it seems to me that you have an idea which you are trying to hitchhike on a bill that perhaps should be a separate process rather than relating it to this bill. I see nothing in this bill which prohibits State vocational rehabilitation agencies from being employed or being used. It seems to me cooperation is set up in the bill for that group as well as the other. The physically handicapped have some of the same needs as all other people. Their needs are not only those that relate to their health but also housing and the general community. These things are also of interest to the physically handicapped as to the other people. It just seems to me that you are simply objecting to the question that they are not emphasized enough in this bill. But to set them out as a separate group is exactly what the physically handicapped do not want.

That is my reaction to your statement. Perhaps you can explain why you attempt to have this specialized approach rather than one which would relate their problems to everybody else.

If every group came in with the same idea, then we will end up with no bill at all, it seems to me, but with a hundred different approaches to the same problem, and we will be back just where we were in the beginning. Nobody will get helped and everybody will have his own special program.

If there is any value in this approach it is that it is a comprehensive overall approach to the problem; one of coordinating all the forces in the community to help everybody who is impoverished. Everybody has to rise with it or else each individual group is going to fall.

That is my reaction to your statement. I would like to have your comments.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, we have so much zeal for this subject, we might not be above what you call riding on the coattail of a program or something like that.

Mr. HAWKINS. Hitchhiking just in order to get \$20 million. I do not think that is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Really, that is not the idea here. We all have plenty to do. It is not that. I think there are logical reasons for this approach.

In the first place, handicapped people do require special services. They do not fit into these other programs as the general rank-and-file do. For instance, the Department of Labor says that 12 percent of all the people who are coming to them in the manpower development and training program are handicapped but they are serving a very small percentage of them, by their own reports. In other words, they are slipping through.

We are convinced that the severely handicapped people cannot be very well served; for instance, through the camps that are proposed. Their disabilities make them less likely to fit into the regular training programs that are developed in schools for classes of individuals.

The very fact that we have a Vocational Rehabilitation Act which Congress passed and which it has supported liberally in its emphasis is the fact that there are special programs that have to operate in special ways in order to serve this particular group of people.

Mr. HAWKINS. Agreeing with you, is there anything in the bill which prohibits that being done? Why can't that be done under the bill as it is now written?