

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you feel that under the definition that appears in the opportunity crusade, it would be necessary that you terminate your programs on reservations or that whoever was in charge of community action programs would find it necessary to terminate these programs?

Mr. BERRY. I think we could probably bring it within rural.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You are not implying then that under the opportunity crusade there would not be just as much opportunity to deal with these programs on reservations as is permissible under the present law?

Mr. BERRY. I think, Mr. Chairman, my response to that is that the element injected in the crusade bill providing for State plans for the development of community action programs within a State effectively would create a means of obstructing and carrying on programs with Indian reservations because in many States the State takes an adversary position vis-a-vis the reservation within their territorial limits.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You then feel that moving forward under the opportunity crusade as written in the bill which the committee is studying, would terminate these programs?

Mr. BERRY. It would constitute a deterrent and we would probably have to seek further clarification of congressional intent.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Fine. If there is such a gap that is present, we appreciate your calling this to our attention in this regard, Mr. Pucinski, because this certainly was not my understanding of what Mr. Quie and Mr. Goodell had intended.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think as my colleague proceeds in these hearings and continues to compare the opportunity crusade with the existing law, he will find that we are going to have to have more and more amendments to the opportunity crusade. When we are all through, we will find that the opportunity crusade is similar to what we are doing now.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, again let me repeat what I said in the beginning. It is my understanding that the purpose of these hearings is to listen to the witnesses and not engage in intracommittee discussion. If what we are doing is engaging in intracommittee debate, let's understand the ground rules and go forward on that basis.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the chairman yield on that statement?

We have gone this route before, and I think my colleague ought to know that the only reason I asked the questions about the opportunity crusade is that I don't want, when we go to the floor, someone to say that we have never discussed the opportunity crusade. I think that we will make great progress here if as we go along we will ask questions about H.R. 8311 and H.R. 10682, and I reserve my right to continue doing that. I don't consider this any intracommittee discussion. I think it is a perfectly legitimate role of probing to see where are the best formulas for making this program work.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let the record be clear that counsel has just informed me that there is no State plan except for the bonus section involved in the community action program, under the opportunity crusade, and I think we ought to check this to be sure that the present authority, which is evidently that under which the community action