

grams if we feel certain laws are being violated in a substantial fashion? I would like to see built into the bills the right to judicial review and a clear hearing procedure.

The third point I would like to make is while we are talking about consulting in the States, one of the problems is that many of the States and localities unfortunately have still not come to the place where they are going to take responsibility. In Mississippi, we are suffering because of money the State loses from Federal programs. If we had the unemployed fathers program in welfare in Mississippi, we would be a lot better off than we are. It is not a solution, but it would keep a number of people from starving. The States, particularly in the South simply have not shown their willingness to take advantage fully of Federal programs by putting up a State matching share, or to carry those programs out in a way in which they are intended.

I would like to see a different kind of bypass mechanism built in whereby if States and localities—you have written it positively as I have read it—must agree to take these things assuming they meet certain requirements. I would also like to see it say that if the State and locality have not seen fit to take advantage of this program, the Federal Government should have the option, in areas of greatest need, to go ahead and carry on the program directly. We might think about that.

I know it is complicated, but again in the food area, I have argued with the Agriculture Department that they have the authority to initiate community distribution programs if the State refuses to do it. They refuse to do it in most, if not every instance. That is our big fight with them. That is why I think that should be left in there, that if the States refuse to do their duty, the Federal Government should act under certain clear cut conditions.

I would like to join with our other speakers here in the invitation to come out and see Resurrection City. I would like to say again, you are Senators with votes. We are here to ask, and I think Mrs. Arsenault is correct, that the compulsory work program for mothers, should be repealed. We are here to say that the freeze is not the answer to poverty. We want that repealed.

We are here to say that we want to work. It seems to me that this Congress, if it wants to, can put together an adequate jobs bill. I know the problems of appropriations, and I know again that there are other ways you can cut it if you want to. We need the job bill. People want to work. It seems to be minimal. This Congress should respond to that very just demand.

You hear the problems the chief talked about of housing. People here say they want decent housing. There is a housing bill pending before you. You people can do that. All of us are aware of the atmosphere in this country today. But again, you are leaders. I think there are many ways you can mold the opinion of this country. You have a supplemental appropriation for summer jobs and Headstart pending in conference; it is minimal. When you are talking about that, you are talking about avoiding 30-percent cuts in Mississippi programs from last year's level of programing for needy Headstart children.

I disagree with the priority that says we should cut out jobs, 30 percent in Mississippi, so that people can be thrown out of jobs this winter and have to come up and take money, the same money you are