

the legal services program, I suppose they could say that those programs are less important than a rat eradication program.

Mr. GOODELL. My concern is this. You believe in unearmarked funds, and I do, too. I think the local community should set its priorities. Any community today may set up priorities as they wish for rat eradication, and make application under the community action program, or the demonstration program, and get money 100 percent funded from the Federal Government, 90:10—

Mr. SHRIVER. It's 80:20.

Mr. GOODELL. It may be 80:20 in Chicago now. I won't quibble over that. They are available, are they not?

Mr. SHRIVER. The answer is yes, but there are so many competing requests for that community action money.

Mr. GOODELL. Now, you see, you bother me.

Mr. SHRIVER. I'm not bothering you at all; I hope. Many communities of the United States would like to have money under a different law. It is not under our law, that bill.

Mr. GOODELL. I know that.

Mr. SHRIVER. OK; so it is not in competition. They would not then be in competition with their community action money.

Mr. GOODELL. Why should we set up a separate administrative structure and cost? Why shouldn't we have the administration of the community action program now, and this is what bothers me, is that you seem to be advocating earmarking of money.

If we can do it, earmark \$50 million out of community action program—

Mr. SHRIVER. That is exactly what I was not saying.

Mrs. GREEN. I would ask the gentleman's consent that I be given another minute for the purpose of a correction. If I recall correctly, Henry Reuss preferred that this be under the—he voted for the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. He voted for the rule, but—

Mrs. GREEN. It was my understanding that he made his position clear that he would have preferred it under that, but he certainly was supporting that bill that day.

Mr. GOODELL. You may be right, and he didn't get a chance to debate it, because we voted down the rule.

Chairman PERKINS. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHRIVER. I would just like to say—and excuse me if I may be imposing, Mr. Chairman—that there were 37 riots on demonstrations in the United States before—

Mr. GOODELL. How far back are you going, the Revolution and the Boston Tea Party?

Mr. SHRIVER. 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964. There was an earlier remark that there seemed to be something incidental between riots and OEO.

Mr. GOODELL. There is—

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the Uniform Time Act of 1966 be made applicable to this committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAs. I would ask unanimous consent that I may have such as my colleague from New York had.