

y4  
. Ed 8/1  
Ac 8/2

1015

Ac 8/2  
1/8 8/1  
9274

# ACTION PROGRAM

GOVERNMENT  
Storage

## HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

### H.R. 14828

A BILL AUTHORIZING CONTINUATION OF PROGRAMS OF  
ACTION, CREATING A NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR  
THAT AGENCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 10, 1972

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

KSU LIBRARIES  
A11900 983280  
006174



1/8 63.  
Ae 8/2

ACTION PROGRAM

HEARING  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

- EDITH GREEN, Oregon
- FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
- JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
- ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
- DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
- JOHN BRADEMAM, Indiana
- JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
- AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
- WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
- PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
- JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
- LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
- PHILLIP BURTON, California
- JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
- WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
- SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
- MARIO BIAGGI, New York
- ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
- LOUISE DAY HICKS, Massachusetts
- ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
- HERMAN BADILLO, New York
- ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
- JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
- ALPHONZO BELL, California
- JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
- JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
- MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
- EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
- WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
- EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
- ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
- EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
- EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
- VICTOR V. VEYSEY, California
- JACK F. KEMP, New York
- PETER A. PEYSER, New York
- CLIFFARD D. CARLSON, Illinois

(II)



## CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
Text of H.R. 14828.....	1
Statement of—	
Blatchford, Joseph H., director of ACTION, accompanied by Christopher Mould, acting associate director of ACTION for Domestic Relations; and Mrs. Connie Newman, VISTA.....	4
Statement of, letters:	
Blatchford, Joseph H., director of ACTION:	
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated August 18, 1972.....	26
Letter to Chairman Perkins, dated September 7, 1972.....	21
Statement of.....	7

# CONTENTS

1	Statement of T. K. M. H. 1938
4	Statement of letters Blanchard, Joseph H., director of ACTION, accompanied by Joseph Alford, acting associate director of ACTION for Domestic Relations; and Mrs. Corde Newman, VISTA
26	Blanchard, Joseph H., director of ACTION; Letter to Chairman Perkins dated August 18, 1938
27	Letter to Chairman Perkins dated September 7, 1938
7	Statement of

## ACTION PROGRAM

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1972

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,  
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr. presiding.

Present: Representatives Thompson, Dellenback, Steiger, Ruth, Kemp, and Carlson.

Staff members present: Donald M. Baker, chief clerk and associate counsel; William H. Cable, counsel, and Dr. Martin L. LaVor, minority legislative associate.

(Text of H.R. 14828 follows:)

[H.R. 14828, 92d Cong. Second Sess.]

A BILL Authorizing continuation of programs of Action, creating a National Advisory Council for that agency, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Action Domestic Programs Act of 1972".*

### TITLE I—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

SEC. 101. Section 801 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full- and part-time voluntary service, and for the operation and funding of special and demonstration volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development, encouragement, and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is primarily to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty and, additionally, to deal with a broad range of human, social, and environmental needs through the use of volunteers."

SEC. 102. Section 810 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director of Action (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'Director') may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or Indian reservations, in full-time volunteer programs, and, upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to programs and activities designed to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine, including work assignments in their own or nearby communities. No program designed to carry out the purpose of this title shall be established within a State unless such program has been submitted to the Governor and has not been disapproved by him within forty-five days of such submission. The assignment of a volunteer in any State shall be terminated by the Director when so requested by the Governor of such State not later than thirty days or at a time thereafter

agreed upon by the Governor and the Director after such request has been made by the Governor to the Director."

SEC. 103. Section 810 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The term 'Governor' as used in this section means the Governor of the State, in the case of any of the 50 States, and in the case of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the chief executive officer thereof."

SEC. 104. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 811 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to achieving the purposes of this title and the goals of the projects or programs to which they are assigned."

SEC. 105. Subsection (b) of section 811 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for such periods of service as the Director may determine."

SEC. 106. Subsection (c) of section 811 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Volunteers under this part shall, upon enrollment, take the same oath of office as prescribed for persons enrolled in the Peace Corps (22 U.S.C. 2504 (j)): *Provided*, That persons legally residing within the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, either permanently or temporarily, but who are not citizens of the United States, may serve in programs carried on under this title without taking or subscribing to such oath, if the Director determines that the service of those persons will further the interests of the United States. Those persons shall take such alternative oath or affirmation as Director shall deem to be appropriate. No funds may be expended to transport such persons either to or from any place outside the areas specified in this subsection."

SEC. 107. (a) Section 812 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) For the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a volunteer shall be deemed to be paid and to receive each amount of any such stipend to which he is entitled under this section when such amount is transferred from funds made available for the payment of such stipend to the fund from which such stipend is payable."

(b) Section 1304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1304) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) For treatment of the stipend paid to VISTA volunteers and volunteer leaders, see section 812(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2992b (d))."

SEC. 108. (a) Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 813. (a) VISTA ALLOWANCES.—In the case of an individual who is a volunteer or volunteer leader within the meaning to title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, amounts received as allowances other than amounts received as—

"(1) leave allowance, or

"(2) such portion of living allowances as the Director may determine as constituting basic compensation shall not be included in gross income for purposes of income taxation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) Section 3401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3401(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(17) to a volunteer or volunteer leader within the meaning of title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, except stipends, leave allowances, or living allowances determined by the Director of ACTION to be basic compensation."

and by eliminating the word "or" from the end of paragraph 15 and adding it to the end of paragraph 16.

(c) Section 124(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 124(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(19) Certain allowances paid to VISTA volunteers and volunteer leaders, see section 813 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2992(c))."

SEC. 109. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 820 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis

or for short periods of service either in their home or nearby communities or elsewhere, in volunteer activities contributing to elimination of poverty or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of this title."

SEC. 110. Section 822 of such Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 111. Subsection (c) of section 833 of such Act is amended to insert after the word "service" the first time it appears the following: ", including training."

SEC. 112. Section 835 of such Act is hereby repealed.

## TITLE II—NATIONAL OLDER AMERICANS VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) Section 601 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No compensation provided to individual volunteers under this part shall be considered income for any purposes whatsoever."

SEC. 202. (a) The heading of part B of title VI of such Act is amended to read as follows: "FOSTER GRANDPARENT PROGRAM AND OTHER SENIOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS".

(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 611. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to or contracts with public and nonprofit private agencies and organizations to pay part or all of the cost of the development and operation of community projects designed to provide volunteer opportunities for low-income persons aged sixty or over to render supportive services to people having exceptional needs.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), grants or contracts shall be made principally for projects providing services as 'foster grandparents' to children receiving care in hospitals, homes for dependent and neglected children, or other establishments providing care for children with special needs.

"(c) Payments under this part pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and on such conditions, as the Director may determine."

(c) The first sentence of section 613 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 613. In administering this part, the Director shall consult with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and any other Federal agencies administering relevant programs with a view of achieving optimal coordination with such other programs and shall promote the coordination of projects under this part with other public or private programs or projects carried out at State and local levels."

SEC. 203. (a) Title VI of such Act is amended by striking out the word "Secretary" wherever it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "Director".

(b) Such title is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

### "MEANING OF DIRECTOR

"SEC. 615. For purposes of this title, the term 'Director' means the 'Director of Action.'"

(c) Section 202(3) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ", except for title VI thereof".

## TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council for Action (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall consist of not more than 35 members appointed by the President. They shall be broadly representative of educational institutions, voluntary agencies, farm organizations, business and labor organizations, volunteers, and other public and private organizations and groups as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of Action. The Council shall advise and consult with the President and the Director of Action (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Director") with regard to policies and programs designed to further the purposes of that agency.

(b) Members of the Council shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call or at the call of the Director. Members of the Council, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the President or the Director, shall receive no compensation but may each receive out of funds available for the purposes of Action, while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, actual travel expenses and a per diem allowance or actual and necessary expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 302. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to any public or non-profit private agencies, organizations, or institutions in the United States and to enter into contracts with any such agencies, organizations, or institutions, or with any individuals in the United States—

(1) to develop and demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods with respect to the recruitment, training, and use of full-time and part-time volunteers for service to communities in the United States;

(2) to evaluate new approaches, techniques, and methods; and

(3) to foster the establishment by public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions of new programs for the use of full-time and part-time volunteers to perform work in the United States of the type described in section 801 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended by section 201 of this Act.

(b) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Director may require the recipient of a grant or contract under this section to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(c) Payments under this section pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments and on such conditions as the Director may determine.

SEC. 303. The Director is authorized, at the request of any executive department or agency, to recruit, train, accept, utilize, and refer to such department or agency, volunteers who will provide voluntary services which are not formally performed by the employees of such department or agency.

SEC. 304. The Director is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of Action. Gifts and bequests of money and proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury and shall be disbursed upon the order of the Director. Property accepted pursuant to this section, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift or bequest. For the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (including sections 170(j), 2055(f), 2106(a)(2)(f), and 2522(d)), property accepted under this section shall be considered as a gift or bequest to the United States.

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or otherwise fixed by law to Action for a fiscal year to carry out any activity or function vested in that agency may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out any other such activity or function.

SEC. 306. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Director to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, except those authorized under the Peace Corps Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. The committee will be in order.

We have for consideration today H.R. 14828. We have the pleasure this morning of having Mr. Joseph Blatchford, the director of ACTION, before us.

Good morning, Mr. Blatchford.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is nice to see you. Please proceed as you wish.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD, DIRECTOR OF ACTION, ACCOMPANIED BY CHRISTOPHER MOULD, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF ACTION FOR DOMESTIC RELATIONS; AND MRS. CONNIE NEWMAN, VISTA**

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a short statement and a long statement. I would like to read the short statement and submit the longer one, the detailed one, for the record if I may.

Mr. THOMPSON. Good. That is fine.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members:

Nearly a year and a half ago President Nixon transmitted to Congress a reorganization plan proposing the creation of ACTION. After a thorough review by both Houses, Congress affirmed this plan. On July 1, 1971 ACTION came into being.

ACTION is a diverse citizens service corps conceived by the President as "the first step toward a system of voluntary service which uses to the fullest advantage the power of all the American people to serve \* \* \* the Nation." As part of that first step ACTION brought together from throughout the Federal Government six volunteer programs: VISTA, the foster grandparent program, the retired senior volunteer program, the Senior Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE), the Active Corps of Executives (ACE), and the Peace Corps.

Each of ACTION's component programs retained its own identity and mission. At the same time each has been strengthened through interagency sharing in such areas as program development and volunteer recruitment and training.

While the Peace Corps continues to assist in social and economic development abroad and to promote peace and friendship through mutual understanding, VISTA is combating poverty and its tragic consequences here at home. Some 441 projects are underway for fiscal year 1973, in which VISTA volunteers bring their considerable skills to bear on problems of inadequate health care, economic development, substandard education and housing, chronic unemployment, inadequate social and legal services, and community planning.

We anticipate 5,300 man-years of full-time domestic antipoverty volunteer service in fiscal year 1973 in contrast to 4,892 in fiscal year 1972 and 4,582 in fiscal year 1971.

Foster Grandparents are providing companionship, guidance, and affection to institutionalized children with exceptional needs.

Retired Senior Volunteers are using their talents and experience in community service projects, which are planned and organized at the local level.

SCORE and ACE Volunteers are giving their advice and expertise and using their years of experience and know-how to assist small businesses and nonprofit organizations with management and operational problems.

With the increased funding for our Older Americans volunteer Programs initiated by the President and approved by Congress, the number of Foster Grandparents has risen dramatically—from 4,500 to 10,500 by the end of this year. At that time some 22,000 children will benefit from their warmth and affection, qualities that it is difficult for an institution to provide on a one-to-one basis.

Similarly, RSVP—the Retired Senior Volunteer Program—has expanded significantly. Only 1 year ago 11 projects were recruiting their first volunteers. So great is the interest and demand, however, that with the increased funding RSVP will be able to field up to 75,000 volunteers in 300 projects, involving courts, schools, libraries, day care centers, hospitals, nursing homes, economic development centers, and other community centers across the Nation.

ACTION is all these programs. But ACTION is more than the sum of its parts.

In our continuing drive to open up new horizons for citizen service, we initiated the University Year for ACTION—a new program designed to channel the talents of students and the resources of universities into antipoverty endeavors. In the short span of 1 year 1,000 students from 24 campuses participated in this imaginative new venture.

UYA is VISTA in higher education. UYA volunteers give up 1 year of cloistered campus life to work and live in poverty communities. They receive academic supervision and credit. But most important, they have the opportunity to translate their idealism and learning into concrete action to help the poor.

More than 400 colleges and universities have expressed interest in starting a University Year for ACTION. Not surprisingly a recent Gallup poll indicated that 58 percent of college students would like to participate in such a program.

This unique experiment in learning-while-doing has enormous appeal for young people today. It gives them responsibility. It makes their studies "relevant." It allows them to do something constructive in the battle to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

That, after all, is what ACTION is all about.

In 1 year we have built an organization which is responsive to the needs of individuals and communities. We have built an organization that actively encourages and supports individually inspired citizens in the fight against poverty, neglect and simple lack of know-how. We have built an organization that eliminates the wasteful duplication of administrative overhead, in order that energy and money previously spent by each individual program be directed instead to identifying new areas of need and to developing new ways for more people to serve more effectively.

The ACTION bill represents an essential next step toward the realization of our goals. Our experience over the past year indicates the need for a broader interpretation of our mission. The ACTION bill you are considering today gives us the necessary authority to increase our ability to respond to America's needs and to fulfill our potential.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill has been submitted for the record, so I will not go into the details at this time. Suffice it to say that the new authority we seek will make ACTION's programs even more responsive in meeting people's needs, even more effective in helping to solve our Nation's problems.

It will enable a VISTA volunteer to serve 2 years instead of 1, thus doubling his effectiveness in breaking the vicious circle of poverty and despair. It will enable volunteers in the Foster Grandparent program to extend their services to people with exceptional needs whether institutionalized or not, whether young or old.

It will enable us to expand opportunities for citizen service by cooperating in projects which are initiated, designed, and operated at the local level.

Repeatedly during the past year ACTION has been approached by community groups, local, State and Federal agencies. They come to us

with legitimate requests for volunteers, guidance and support for a variety of innovative projects. We have talked at length and in depth with concerned individuals and groups about numerous possibilities for increased volunteer action. We want to be able to respond to those legitimate requests. We want to be able to explore those possibilities with pilot programs such as UYA, which has proved so successful. The ACTION bill will give us the authority to do so.

Perhaps most exciting, our proposed legislation will enable ACTION volunteers to respond more readily and more effectively to a broad range of human, social and environmental needs. The ACTION bill not only renews our commitment to today's poor, but extends it to the source of tomorrow's needs—our decaying cities, the polluted environment, overcrowded jails and overburdened courts. Only by reaching out on a person-to-person basis can we hope to bridge life's many inequities and remedy society's injustices.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD, DIRECTOR OF ACTION

Mr. Chairman, nearly a year and a half ago, President Nixon transmitted to Congress a Reorganization Plan proposing the creation of ACTION. After thorough review by both houses, Congress affirmed this Plan, and ACTION came into being on July 1, 1971. When passed, the Bill before you today will mark another step in the government's capacity to develop, promote, encourage and support volunteers as a resource for the accomplishment of community goals and the meeting of individual needs.

The creation of ACTION involved bringing together VISTA, Foster Grandparents, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, SCORE/ACE and the Peace Corps. Since July 1, 1971, the staffs of these programs have worked together here in Washington, and in the Regional Offices of ACTION, to build an integrated and responsive organization which meets the needs of individuals and communities. The creation of ACTION involved, too, the expression of an idea—the idea that the encouragement of voluntary activities should not be an incidental sideline of agencies with other direct responsibilities but should, instead, be the full-time mission of a unique organization. Only by focusing responsibility in this way can we be sure that the volunteer effort is meeting human and social needs. This organization would combine advocacy of citizen service with skill in the design and operation of volunteer programs and with the resources necessary to support the development of new volunteer programs when local resources are insufficient. None of the programs which were joined in ACTION possessed all these attributes, and their combination resulted in some overlapping, and left some parts of the task incomplete. The ACTION Bill, before you today, seeks to clarify such questions, where necessary, and will provide authority for ACTION to continue to develop the capacity to perform its proper role.

Volunteers respond to human needs, and a volunteer program which arbitrarily categorizes or freezes volunteer activities is an incomplete and inadequate volunteer program. For instance, when a VISTA discovers an elderly person who lives alone and is able to buy food and other necessities only with great difficulty because of the distance between home and store, he does not pause to ask whether this older person's pension is enough to make him, technically, "poor." Rather, he seeks to find a way to solve the problem, looks for a neighbor who could do the shopping, or contacts Meals-on-Wheels for help. Or, when a mentally retarded child leaves the institution where he has learned enough to be able to live at home, both he and his Foster Grandparent may well wonder at regulations which forbid continuing the relationship which has meant so much to both.

Accordingly, the ACTION Bill contains two provisions which will significantly extend ACTION's authority to support the efforts of volunteers: Section 101 amends 801 of the Economic Opportunity Act to allow it to stand as a statement of purpose for ACTION as well as VISTA by authorizing support for volunteers working to eliminate poverty and to meet a "broad range of human, social and environmental needs." And section 202 amends section 611 of the Older Americans Act to extend the services of persons enrolled in the Foster Grandparents

Program to people with the exceptional needs whether institutionalized or not, whether young or old. The amendments to section 611 of the Older Americans Act would, for the first time, permit low income persons over 60 years of age to work with children in the children's homes or in community settings. Present legislation limits Foster Grandparents' activities to hospitals, homes for dependent and neglected children or other establishments providing care for children with special needs.

We need to understand that it is impossible to define in advance exactly which human needs can and should be met by volunteers, which forms of desperation, disease and need are "legally acceptable" and which the volunteers must be instructed to refuse to meet so long as their projects receive support from ACTION. Volunteers themselves are the best safeguards against ineffectiveness because they simply refuse to devote a year of their lives to projects which make no contribution to a better world.

The Foster Grandparent Program has been run essentially as a program to provide companionship, care and specific rehabilitation assistance to children who are in institutions and thereby deprived of normal parental relationships. The program's goal is to supplement the group care of the institutions to add a dimension of warmth and concern that no institution can provide on a one-to-one basis. In carrying out this policy, all grants for new programs since the 1969 amendments to the Older Americans Act have been made for projects involving one-to-one service to children with exceptional needs in institutional settings.

The Foster Grandparent Program will continue to provide person-to-person services. However, the expanded authority in the ACTION Bill would also enable senior volunteers to serve other older adults, and children in groups as well as on a one-to-one basis.

The Older American programs have received significant increases in funding since their transfer to ACTION. In mid FY '72, the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) received \$15 million in appropriations with carry over authority to December of 1972, and as of July 31, 149 RSVP grants had been awarded obligating \$7.6 million. By August 31, it is estimated that \$9 million will be obligated representing some 200 grant awards. At the end of the calendar year it is expected that over 300 grants will have been awarded which would support up to 75,000 volunteers.

The Foster Grandparent program (FGP) received \$25 million in FY '72, with similar carry over authority and the program has obligated as of July 31, approximately \$24.3 million in 136 projects which will mobilize a volunteer force of 10,500 foster grandparents.

Title II of the ACTION Bill contains several amendments to Title VI of the Older Americans Act principally affecting the Foster Grandparent Program. Almost identical provisions have already passed the House as part of the Older Americans Act Amendments in H.R. 15657 on July 17. The only difference between the applicable provisions of the ACTION Bill and the House bill concerns the level of authorized funding. The ACTION Bill requests an authorization of such sums as may be necessary to enable the Agency to carry out its functions, powers and duties. However, the House bill provides a three-year authorization for both RSVP and FGP which are respectively: FY '73, \$20 million and \$35 million, FY '74 \$30 million and \$45 million and FY '75 \$40 million and \$55 million.

The Senate version of the ACTION Bill (S. 3450) includes the same language as H.R. 14828, as does H.R. 15657. However, as introduced, the Senate amendment to the Older Americans Act does not contain a similar provision.

ACTION would like to have its amendments and authorization for the National Older American Volunteer Program contained in H.R. 14828 or in similar legislation so that the agency can keep all legislation affecting its domestic programs in one bill, an ACTION bill.

This would permit ACTION's domestic program to be considered as a whole before one Congressional committee.

As soon as the President announced his intention to create ACTION, there began an intensive series of discussions with community leaders and volunteers with government officials, educators, anthropologists, experts on voluntarism and social service specialists in the provision of human services. These conversations had two results: First, they were invaluable in shaping the first new efforts of the new agency; second, they convinced us again of the value of contact with members of the concerned public.

Accordingly, the ACTION Bill provides for the creation of a thirty-five member National Advisory Board, broadly representative in membership, which will

provide advice and guidance in both the domestic and international operations of ACTION. (The Peace Corps National Advisory Council will be dissolved in anticipation of the creation of a single National Advisory Council for all of ACTION.)

The National Advisory Council will help sharpen ACTION's responsiveness to the needs and desires of communities which look to us as they design efforts to improve conditions. The Bill also provides that if after 45 days the Governor has not disapproved a project involving full-time ACTION volunteers, his assent to its initiation may be assumed. This provision is a change from what is required in the Economic Opportunity Act for VISTA—where a positive assent is required before initiating projects—because of the frequent delays which have too often stemmed from the previous requirements.

Two other provisions of the new law will permit ACTION to recruit and place full-time volunteers more effectively. One allows the Director to specify an oath of service for resident aliens who may wish to enroll in ACTION's programs—this is provided to prevent possible conflict with laws governing the citizenship of such volunteers. While it is not anticipated that large numbers of resident aliens will be enrolled in full-time service, nonetheless the oath required by VISTA has, from time to time, prevented an exceptional volunteer (with special language skills, for example) from entering service. This technicality should be cleared up. The other provision which will make more effective programming possible is that, under the law, it will be possible for the Director to set flexible terms of service for full-time domestic volunteers. Thus, a term could be set which would exceed the one-year limit presently stated, and when a project requires more than one year's effort on the part of the volunteer, it will be possible to recruit specifically for the longer term of service. In addition to the features of the ACTION Bill discussed with you today, there are numerous technical and perfecting amendments contained in the Bill. A section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation follows.

#### TITLE I—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

Section 101 amends Section 801 of Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to broaden the statement of purpose of Domestic Volunteer Service Programs. The amended statement of purpose would provide authority for ACTION to lend encouragement to an expanded range of volunteer activities, which could involve both full and part-time volunteers. The enlarged area of service to the volunteer movement in which ACTION would engage implements the goal of the President, expressed in his message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. I of 1971 to the Congress, of developing a capacity for "using to the fullest advantage the power of all the American people to serve the purposes of the American nation."

While volunteers would retain a primary focus on the problems of poverty, additional activities, such as encouraging the use of volunteers in environmental programs, and mobilization of part-time volunteers not heretofore utilized to attack locally perceived problems, could be undertaken.

Section 102 amends Section 810 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize recruitment, training, and assignment of volunteers in the expanded programs authorized by the revised statement of mission.

The Section also revises the existing provisions requiring that the governor of a state affirmatively approve a volunteer program before it begins. Under the revised provision the governor would have 45 days to disapprove a program. Lack of a definite time frame for approval or disapproval of programs has been a serious hindrance to planning in the past. This provision is similar to veto provisions in other parts of the Economic Opportunity Act except that the Director has no authority to override a veto, and the governor retains the right to require the withdrawal of volunteers.

Section 103 provides a definition of the term "governor" which makes it clear that the chief executives of the District of Columbia, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands will have the same duties and privileges as the chief executives of other jurisdictions.

Section 104 is a technical amendment which conforms the language of 811 of the Economic Opportunity Act to the new expanded mission of ACTION.

Section 105 substitutes a new provision permitting the Director to determine the period for which a volunteer may be enrolled. Since the present provision permits the Director to decrease the term of service for full-time volunteers from

the normal one year plus training to two months, the principal effect of the provision will be to permit enrollments of longer than one year. This will permit experimentation with combined international and domestic volunteer service which has not previously been possible because of the difference between the Peace Corps enlistment term (two years) and the VISTA term (one year). A guiding principle in all cases will be that the term of service must be of sufficient length to justify the cost of training.

Section 106 provides that VISTA's will, in the future, take the oath now prescribed for Peace Corps service. In addition to removing one small impediment to combined international and domestic service, standardizing the oath moves the agency one step closer to its goal of providing a unified program of voluntary service, rather than several diverse programs administered centrally. An exception for aliens residing in the United States who may wish to enroll in Domestic Volunteer Service Programs is provided. Since the Peace Corps oath might conflict with the laws of these persons own countries, the Director is authorized to prescribe an alternative oath for them.

Section 107 is aimed at providing VISTA volunteers readjustment allowances with the same tax treatment currently available to Peace Corps volunteers. The language of the Peace Corps Act, which provides that the allowance will be taxed ratably over the period in which it accrued, but will not be taxable, until the volunteer receives the allowance is added as a new subsection (d) to Section 812 of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Section 108 also eliminates an inequity presently existing between the treatment afforded a Peace Corps volunteer and a VISTA volunteer under the tax laws. The new provision would adopt the Peace Corps practice, which permits the Director to determine what part of leave and living allowances are compensation for tax purposes. Other allowances, such as food and lodging allowances, would be exempt from tax. This is the present Peace Corps practice. The allowances now referred to as "living allowance," amounting to \$75 per month, which is for personal expenses, would be taxable, as would leave allowance and the readjustment allowance.

Section 109 amends Section 820(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act, relating to short-term and part-time volunteer programs to authorize the use of these volunteers in the expanded ACTION volunteer programs.

Section 110 is a technical amendment repealing an expired section of the Act relating to volunteer programs to assist youthful criminal offenders.

Section 111 adds a volunteer's training period to the period which becomes creditable service in the event of later employment by the Federal government. This treatment is already extended to Peace Corps volunteers.

Section 112 repeals Section 835, which limits the period during which the program may be carried out, and which, unless repealed or amended will require a termination of the program.

## TITLE II

Section 201 amends Section 601 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide that no compensation paid to individual volunteers in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) for out-of-pocket expenses shall be considered income for any purposes whatsoever. This confirms the informal indication of the Internal Revenue Service that they do not consider such compensation as taxable income. It also resolves such questions as those which have been raised by welfare offices with regard to deducting, from benefits paid to welfare recipients involved in RSVP, the monies they receive as reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incident to their volunteer service.

Section 202 amends Section 611 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide additional opportunities for low-income persons aged 60 or over to render supportive services to people having exceptional needs. This includes the person-to-person services presently provided under Part B, Foster Grandparent Program, to children in institutions, i.e. hospitals, homes for dependent and neglected children or other establishments providing care for children with special needs. It is intended that appropriations under this part will be used principally for the Foster Grandparent Program.

In addition, it includes services described by the President at the White House Conference on Aging on December 2, 1971, where he stated that the kinds of persons who participate in the Foster Grandparent Program should also work with older people. This expansion of Part B would also permit low-income older people to work with children with exceptional needs in their own homes or with

children and adults with exceptional needs in community settings. These expanded programs would operate under regulations which are substantially similar to those which presently exist for the Foster Grandparent Program.

Section 203. This substitutes the Director of ACTION for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wherever it appears in Title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965. This is in keeping with the transfer of Title VI programs to the Director of ACTION pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971.

Section 301 establishes a National Advisory Council for ACTION—one of the proposals contained in the President's message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971 to the Congress. The Council would consist of 35 members appointed by the President who would be broadly representative of those areas of society with the greatest interest in and most direct knowledge of voluntary action programs. The Council would advise and consult with the President and the Director, and would serve without compensation.

Section 302 would authorize grants and contracts to public and nonprofit private agencies to develop new programs and approaches to a broad range of aspects of voluntary service, to evaluate these approaches, and to foster the establishment by public and private agencies of programs using full and part-time volunteers. Carrying out another proposal of the President's message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1971, the Director would be authorized to require cost-sharing by the recipients when he makes grants or contracts with agencies.

Section 303 opens up the field of federal government to volunteers—so long as the service they perform is not normally performed by employees of the federal agency to which the volunteers are assigned.

Section 304 authorizes the Director of ACTION to accept gifts on behalf of the agency. This is a clarifying amendment, providing ACTION with the authority now contained in the Peace Corps Act and the Economic Opportunity Act.

Section 305 provides the Director with a limited amount of programmatic flexibility by permitting him to transfer not more than 10% of the funds available to ACTION in any year to any other program activity.

Section 306 provides a permanent authorization of appropriations to the agency to carry out all its functions except those authorized under the Peace Corps Act for which separate legislation has been enacted. The fact that numerous activities, contained in several different pieces of authorizing legislation, must be coordinated within a relatively small agency makes it virtually mandatory that the agency not be required to go through both the authorization and appropriation process for each separate program each year. This provision would limit the number of mandatory appearances each year, but would not, of course, prevent any committee from requesting or requiring the agency to provide information or testimony to it where such information or testimony would be helpful or useful.

During ACTION's first year, there has been important progress in each of the voluntary programs. Most dramatic is the increase in funding for the Older Americans Volunteer Programs—Foster Grandparents and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program—but no less important is the careful rethinking of VISTA's role in community efforts to achieve economic progress and the new support and recognition given to SCORE volunteers. At the same time, there have been measurable savings in support costs—especially in the area of recruiting—and the development of new ties and interrelationships between all the programs of ACTION. And, in its first year, ACTION has launched two new programming efforts which move significantly in the direction charted by President Nixon when he proposed the creation of ACTION: both University Year for ACTION and ACTION's Cooperative Programs place programming initiative with local community groups and program direction in the hands of local institutions as well as contributing to the growth of the number of volunteers engaged in the fight against poverty.

Following the White House Conference on Aging, the Older Americans Volunteer Programs received substantial increases in funding, and a strong mandate from the delegates to the Conference, and the Congress to continue the growth of these service opportunities for senior citizens. Already, the Foster Grandparent program has initiated projects which will, when fully developed, provide 21,000 institutionalized children with loving attention from 10,500 Foster Grandparents; this is a 140% increase over the program level of one year ago. At the same time, RSVP has grown even more rapidly, and by the end of this calendar year arrangements will have been made to field up to 75,000 senior volunteers in over 300 projects in every state. One year ago there were 11 projects which had no volunteers because they were just getting started.

SCORE has received increased visibility, support and challenge since ACTION began to share in the administration of this program with the Small Business Administration. SCORE volunteers are now actively engaged in assisting small businessmen with management problems through 184 chapters across the country. Many of the 4173 SCORE volunteers have become involved with the management problems of non-profit organizations, too, since the merger, assisting VISTA and University Year for ACTION volunteers and other anti-poverty projects with consulting advice based on their long years of experience in the business world.

In the first six months of 1972, 70 new VISTA projects were opened which involved 282 VISTA volunteers in new efforts to reduce the burden of poverty on people in those 70 communities. During the same period, 45% of ongoing projects were evaluated and 73 older projects were closed down—involving 128 volunteers, nearly half of whom were transferred to other projects. Some projects were closed because the work of the VISTAs had been completed and there were some which were terminated because it had become clear, through evaluations and site visits, that there was little hope of the projects making a contribution to the elimination of poverty through the efforts of the volunteers.

Recently developed evaluation criteria represent a renewed commitment to focusing the role of the VISTA volunteer on contributing to and reinforcing the efforts of local citizens and organizations to eliminating poverty. Under these program guidelines, the VISTA's major role is that of a catalyst, mobilizing local and other resources for the purpose of effectively solving the problems of the poor.

And, too, we have laid down a new challenge to those who train and provide technical assistance to VISTAs, seeking to increase the effectiveness of the training and the utility of the technical assistance to volunteers engaged in this activity.

Though cost savings were not the primary reason for the creation of ACTION, I am sure you will be pleased to learn that some significant savings have resulted from the merger which created ACTION. Our analysis indicates that in the area of recruiting a net saving of \$822,000 resulted from combining the recruiting efforts for Peace Corps and VISTA and eliminating overlapping functions (such as campus and city campaigns for each program separately).

We have also redesigned the organization of the ACTION regional offices, assigning responsibility for all ACTION programs within a given state to a program officer who can then prepare, in consultation with members of communities within that state, the most appropriate combination of ACTION programs to meet that community's needs.

During the past year, the number of full-time ACTION volunteers engaged in the fight against poverty has increased, and plans call for greater increases in the coming year. These volunteers consist of VISTAs, assigned to projects in 441 communities from Maine to Guam, plus University Year for ACTION and Co-operative Program volunteers who have joined in ACTION's programs under new arrangements made since the merger.

Within the legislative mandate provided ACTION in the Reorganization Plan and after consultation with members of Congress, educators, community groups, and students, ACTION began in the late summer of 1972 a new idea in volunteer service—the University Year for ACTION program.

UYA is VISTA in higher education. It is full time, full-year volunteers working to combat poverty. UYA volunteers are college students receiving guidance from their schools and academic credit for their work. UYA enables committed students and universities to help the poor. In the short span of one year, ACTION has developed the program and fielded 1,000 volunteers from 24 universities across the nation.

Upwards of 400 colleges and universities would like to start programs if given the opportunity and, in a recent Gallup Poll, 58% of college students said they would like to join such a program.

The program has been sufficiently popular on campuses where it now operates that all 24 universities want to enlarge it. With the agencies to which UYA volunteers have been assigned, the program has been successful enough that 81% would hire the volunteers if they could, and at salaries in excess of \$8,000. (Volunteers receive a little more than \$3,000 for their year's work.)

While we have been working to strengthen VISTA and develop UYA, we have been talking with concerned individuals and groups about numerous ideas for greatly expanded citizen service. People have come to ACTION over the past year with ideas for specific projects. They include—

— The Office of Environmental Programs in the U.S. Office of Education asked that we supply an ACTION volunteer to each of the 10 federal regions to help

design environmental programs in cooperation with other Office of Education projects. Skilled and experienced people who have already volunteered to ACTION are available to take these jobs.

— The Midwest Regional Center for Deaf/Blind Children located in Michigan requested volunteers to serve as community outreach workers and to assist the children in making the difficult transition from the institutions to life on the "outside".

— Department of Health, Education and Welfare has proposed that up to 300 volunteers per year join their efforts to discover the extent of incipient lead poisoning and rid American communities of the hazard of chipping lead based paint—a major source of lead poisoning.

— The public schools of the city of Minneapolis have asked for 17 volunteers to work in designing programs which will help the schools be more responsive to low-income and under-privileged children in their classrooms.

— Glasgow, Montana (Mountain Plains Education and Economic Development Program) hopes to establish a career education and development center where 19 volunteers would work with low-income family units drawn from neighboring Indian tribes, as well as other communities to increase the employability and educational skills of all family members.

These are just a few of the many requests that have come to ACTION from individuals and community groups as well as local, state and other federal agencies. Each of these requests and many others like them involve the sort of voluntary action needed to improve the quality of life in America's communities. We would be proud to work with any of them. And, with the new legislation before you today, ACTION will be in the position to join in *all* these projects, and more. ACTION would be able to join in projects which meet a broad range of pressing human needs, and to support projects which are completely designed and operated at the local level.

There are already numerous examples of projects where ACTION volunteers work on the environmental problems of low-income communities, through the VISTA program. We have recently begun a review of volunteer programs already operating in this area, and are currently consulting with citizens groups, environmental experts, and representatives of volunteer organizations to determine the most appropriate and effective ways in which ACTION's assistance to such projects can be increased.

Over a thousand ACTION volunteers, through VISTA, UYA and the Peace Corps, are now at work in one or another projects involving the administration of justice. ACTION is currently reviewing proposals and ideas for new efforts in this area—one in which volunteers have proven their worth time and time again.

In both these cases, ACTION intends to work with groups which are already active in these fields to develop what are called Cooperative Programs. The kernel of the Cooperative Program idea is that when a volunteer is assigned under a Cooperative Program agreement, the sponsor assumes the direct costs of supporting the volunteer during his term of service while ACTION assists in the development of the project description, recruits volunteers for the project, and provides technical assistance and training to both volunteers and project staff once the project is underway.

VISTA has been involved in cooperative programs since the very beginning, in 1964. In fact, the House report on the deliberations on the Economic Opportunity Act during 1964 contains reference to the idea that volunteers assigned to projects being conducted by the federal government or its agencies should be supported by those projects. The Cooperative Program effort represents, though, a major commitment to this idea, involving active solicitation of agreements with prospective sponsors and the development of routine procedures to meet requests for volunteers; as far as we know, ACTION's present Cooperative Programs represent the first large-scale attempt to implement the concepts expressed in that early Committee Report.

Though the exploration of the potential for new projects in the areas of justice and the environment has only just begun, the Cooperative Programs have now passed the developmental stage and a number of volunteers are already at work under such agreements. We already have evidence that the idea is popular with both sponsors and volunteers. It promises to spark a substantial increase in opportunities for citizen service as well as providing a valued resource to projects which meet real human needs.

Some of the programs I listed—with the Minneapolis Public Schools and the Midwest Center for Deaf/Blind Children, for example—are Cooperative Programs which are currently in development; others are proposals which we have had to defer because the programs are not authorized under current ACTION legislation. The bill you have before you today would permit ACTION to expand its Cooperative Program efforts to all the areas of human need in which volunteers would be willing to serve on projects designed, and paid for, by people who are already active in these fields.

Incidentally, the bill you have before you today would, too, provide an explicit authorization for the use of ACTION volunteers in programs operated by other federal agencies, which will clarify an issue sometimes raised by prospective partners in Cooperative Programs. It will be necessary, of course, that the assignments for the volunteers be consistent with the program requirements of the sponsoring agency and that they do not displace regular staff or other personnel. Using volunteers, though, will allow federal agencies to expand the services they provide the public in an efficient and effective way while at the same time creating a new range of activities for those who wish to volunteer for service.

Finally, the bill before you today represents an appropriate next step in the development of the ACTION idea. It will permit ACTION to respond more readily and effectively to the ideas and enthusiasm of communities and organizations which want to expand the part played by volunteers in their efforts to improve the quality of their lives. And it will strengthen ACTION's efforts to offer opportunities for volunteer service to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who are willing to serve. By passing this bill, the Congress will join in the effort to revitalize the great American tradition of volunteer service and to build upon the foundation represented by VISTA, Foster Grandparents, RSVP, SCORE/ACE, and the Peace Corps toward a future in which voluntary service will once again be a part of every community's efforts to care for the weak and help those who need assistance.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Blatchford.

As you know, when Reorganization Plan No. 1 was before the Committee on Government Operations, I did everything that I could, unsuccessfully, to discourage its enactment. I did so for a number of reasons, not the least of which, I suppose I should admit, is because my pride of authorship of VISTA. My feelings are unchanged.

I stated then and I stated before the Senate and I restate now my enthusiasm for volunteer programs of this nature. I stated before the the Senate and I state now that I think that you are a fine gentleman and I think that you have done really quite well. I am not entirely satisfied, although I do recognize your difficulties with the operation.

First, may I ask you if the bill before us, H.R. 14828, is identical to the Senate bill, 3450, or substantially so?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. It is substantially the same as that one, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And Senator Cranston had hearings on it.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes, he had extensive hearings and I know you yourself testified, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. With respect to the university program, it is my view that that is a splendid idea. I was somewhat surprised by its creation, although I applaud it, because in testifying before the Government Operations Committee you said that ACTION will respond to local initiative and priorities and not create its own.

In a sense, the university program departs from that statement, although I would welcome such a departure and initiative in any other direction in response to the requests that you are getting.

How many VISTA volunteers are in the field today, Mr. Blatchford?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. There are 3,987 volunteers, VISTA volunteers, in the field today.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many were there 3 years ago, do you know?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. There were approximately 4,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. So there are just a few less?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many VISTA volunteers are in training today?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. 481, Mr. Chairman, in training today.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. How many were in training at this time 3 years ago?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. In 1970 there were 2,774. That is 2 years ago. We have those figures. Well, for the whole year, that is, that went into training. We plan on putting 4,068 in training in the coming year.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do these numbers in any case include the UYA students?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No, they do not.

Mr. THOMPSON. They are exclusive of that.

How many staff people were there in the Peace Corps, VISTA, Foster Grandparents, SCORE, ACE, RSVP prior to the reorganization?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. There were at the time of the merger 1,780 slots transferred to ACTION. Now that is the number actually transferred. We know that more than that were actually working on programs because in HEW, OEO and so forth we have this number.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the level of the ACTION staff today?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. 1,729 that are working on the staff today, 50 less than at the time of the merger.

Mr. THOMPSON. When ACTION was proposed, or this tent under which all of these agencies was created, when it was proposed it was represented that there would be a considerable increase in efficiency and cutback in administrative staff, and that has not happened.

The difference between 1,729 and 1,780 does not represent much of a cutback.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, but the programs have grown, Mr. Chairman. The UYA has been created and is operational. I think it has because the Foster Grandparents program has added several hundred more and has already doubled and is on its way to tripling with the same staff, so if we had not broadened the program, you must say we are operating slightly under what we had, but given the fact it has expanded, it is tripling with the older Americans now, I think it has brought about these efficiencies.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to know what your concept of cost-sharing is and how it works.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. The concept is, Mr. Chairman, that there are millions of people in the country ready to serve that could maybe give a year, possibly 2 years of service. The diversity of human needs and demands for services, particularly at the local level, is incredible. We find that the other Federal agencies such as HEW, HUD and the like are constantly pressed to meet some of these services at the local level and that by agreement between a number of Federal agencies we could produce the volunteer HEW or HUD needs at the local level and they will pick up out of their budget, or out of local school boards or boards of education, they can pick up the cost of our volunteers and, therefore, we can expand the volunteer service fitting poverty at the local level tremendously if other units of Government

pay the cost of volunteers, therefore we can maintain our relatively small rise vis-a-vis Federal or other governmental programs and we can recruit through our mechanism, place volunteers in the field, and they can pick up the costs.

We can do it for less than \$4,000, sometimes \$2,000 per volunteer, versus the \$7,000 or \$8,000 we have been spending when we do it all ourselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are VISTA volunteers being used in a cost-sharing program to replace other personnel such as teachers?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; in fact, this issue already came up in a very dramatic way and we found that we are not using VISTA volunteers to replace existing employees, Federal or local, and not replacing any teachers as a result of this.

Mr. Chairman, if I can interrupt a moment, I would like to introduce the two people with me. Chris Mould, Associate Director of ACTION in charge of the domestic programs, and Connie Newman on my left is in charge of all of the VISTA programs. I wanted you to meet them because we, all of us in ACTION, are very aware of your intense and very sincere interest in VISTA and its welfare and there have been charges, criticisms along the line that maybe from the merger there still exists the thought that possibly we have cut back VISTA, the administration has not shown a sufficient interest in it, and I know you have and we are here, all of us, to testify here today to try to get on the record what we have accomplished because we think the record is good and Mrs. Newman can help testify on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Blatchford, I recognize the difficulty that you must have in having to appear before so many committees and so many subcommittees. To the extent that this legislation, as I understand it, would centralize administration and relieve you of the need to spend so much time on the Hill, I agree with it.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. It is an attempt, Mr. Chairman, but I do think it would be up to Congress, I am sure, to continue to determine which way it goes.

Mr. THOMPSON. If I myself can conceive of a way to do it, I am going to try to get VISTA isolated and back on its own. I am not very sanguine about my chances, but every once in a while we can be surprised.

Well, I will have some more questions, but I do not want to take too much time now. Except with respect to the financing, it seemed to me, on looking into the thing, that the university program, of which I thoroughly approve, was to an extent created by a manipulation of the VISTA budget. In short, by using section 821 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which allows 10 percent spending, that UYA, meritorious though it is, has exceeded the 10 percent by using—what is my latest figure?—\$4.2 million; is that correct?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; it is not correct, Mr. Chairman. We have not exceeded our authority there. We have used two different parts. We remained within the limitations in part B and we have in some cases funded the expenses of volunteers who are full time in fighting poverty out of part A.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, the university students are not full time, are they?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; they are fulltime.

Mr. THOMPSON. They are fulltime?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; they are. The concept is not that they would continue on the campus and simply put in a few hours out in volunteer work which goes on in the university.

Mr. THOMPSON. They go out and live there?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; that is right, it is considered, or their full VISTA year is considered worthy of academic credit to the college.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you call them VISTA's or something else?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. It varies greatly. Some places call it ACTION and in some places they are called VISTA, it varies greatly and we let them call them as they wish. It is up to them. I want to add one thing, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a departure from VISTA. In fact, VISTA deserves a lot of the credit for UYA because UYA is built on a successful VISTA program at the University of Colorado.

VISTA's premerger with ACTION has already initiated such a program at the University of Colorado, was working successfully and we expanded it and built the concept of ecology and VISTA previously considered it within their authority to initiate a program such as this and we expanded on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does the university give them academic credit?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And if they are off the campus and living in the ghetto, they get credit?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; I think it is a small program, just starting, but it has a highly significant impact on higher education. It says that you can learn and that learning is achieved academically through what you see and do and deal when working with the poor people in the streets or rural areas.

You don't have to be just reading a textbook or listening to a lecture to be actually accomplishing some kind of academic progress. When I visited the programs, for example, in South Dakota recently the students all tell me they feel more motivated, that they are learning more in a real sense, not just helping more, learning more from that year than they did in the college year and I think we will find, although it is too early to tell, I think we will find also they are more motivated than when they go back to strictly academic pursuits and if at all they will achieve more and learn more academically through this year off of the campus.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, from what I have learned of the university program, I am genuinely sympathetic to it and enthusiastic about it. I do like the concept of it very much.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. We appreciate that and your remarks also in the Senate about this.

Mr. THOMPSON. Some of the other changes proposed in the law would seem to me to take the emphasis to a degree away from poverty and amount to rather sophisticated babysitting programs in some cases, in my judgment. I suppose you are aware of the Green amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, which would preclude ACTION from requiring academic credit for a university year in the ACTION service. It was deleted in conference. I would expect that it is likely to arise again and I would be interested in getting your position on the matter in the record.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; we feel that that amendment would limit ACTION's ability and the colleges themselves—their ability to put the program into the field and expand it. We feel it is a necessity and even more so, it would impinge upon the flexibility of the program. What we continually argued for before the Congress is more flexibility in field volunteers to fight poverty, to allow local institutions to do it and they have testified before the Senate themselves that they would like this flexibility.

Mr. THOMPSON. I agree they should have that flexibility. I am glad you have that attitude. I gather you are glad it was deleted in conference.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, we are glad we are back where we started; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is pretty close to a positive answer.

Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join the chairman, Mr. Blatchford, in welcoming you to the committee. I have a number of questions which I would like to spend some time on and see how much time the chairman's watch will allow each of us as we go along.

No. 1, there is an article in the New York Times of July 3 charging the ACTION agency with being politically oriented, corrupted by partisan politics, I think is the phrase they used and how would you respond to that kind of charge?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, I would respond the same way that I responded to the reporter, that I just thought it was a totally unfounded charge. The volunteer programs have always been nonpartisan and they remain so. We have not given any kind of tests or recruited from any particular sources with our volunteer programs and we recruit our volunteers.

Even on the staff, some appointments are made by the President and obviously with White House suggestion of approval. That has always been the way it was in the past and there is no change. The other staff members are recruited and selected on their capacity and ability, not on politics.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would the gentleman yield on that point, and the Chair will give you plenty of time for your comments.

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Just for this comment. I don't believe your people are being used for partisan politics any more than they were in the previous administration. I consider it to be absolutely inevitable if a volunteer immerses himself in the problems of the poor or of the community that there will be a political involvement, not necessarily on a partisan plane, but rather to correct some of the evils that one finds in the cities or in the rural areas where there are poor.

Your volunteers are highly motivated human beings, and if they are in politics on their own and on their own time, I think that is a very healthy thing, especially if it is to correct ills which have to be corrected through legislative processes or municipal processes. I think that those charges have been unfair in the past and I think they are unfair now.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER. I thank the chairman for his comment very much. Anything further, Joe?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, I would like to just add one word to that. You know, there is a tendency in these programs, I mean it is political to the extent that it is in the United States and within the political system and it was created that way. It is not a private foundation and it is not outside of government.

Consequently, as the chairman suggested, there are people working in this kind of work with a tendency to get involved in politics in some cases here and there and what our job is is to keep them out of politics and keep them on the job and keep them meeting human needs and fighting poverty and maintaining themselves outside of the political fights.

As we go forward in doing that and maintain this very neutral position, we are often accused of being in politics. So that is the logic I have confronted a number of times. That is since I have been here, when you try to keep something out of politics, you are said to be involved in playing politics. I think that is a very reverse logic and I think we have maintained our volunteers and staff outside of active partisan politics.

Mr. STEIGER. I think there is an inevitable problem, as both of you have in fact indicated, about that question of involvement in politics. I, for one, think that the article in the Times and that kind of charge is without any substance at all and, frankly, makes it more difficult for the agency to carry out its function and its programs when that kind of publicity arises. There is a charge also that is made that Action has reduced substantially the number of volunteers working in antipoverty efforts.

Is that a fair charge and, beyond that, it is true, is it not, that you have closed some VISTA projects? And what was the result of that action?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; I would like to respond in general and ask Mrs. Newman to give details on the direction that she has given to VISTA.

The charge is incorrect. The problem is that the President said he would maintain the programs at the time of the merger and he would increase them and increase the opportunities for volunteer services. All right. Then later than that, he sent a supplemental request for \$20 million a year ago, after the merger, to the Congress.

As of today, a year later, that supplemental \$20 million has never been acted upon. It has never been passed. So we have two sets of figures here. What happens without the money and what we had planned to do if we had received it.

Now the yearend strength in fiscal 1971, the premerger strength of VISTA was 4,206 volunteers. OK. Now, without the supplemental we were able to put 4,701 volunteers fighting poverty, including UYA, a year later. So we increased the number of volunteers fighting poverty by 500 with less money.

Mr. STEIGER. How many UYA and how many VISTA people are involved?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is about 3,700 VISTA and 1,000 UYA.

OK, now what would have happened if we had gotten the supplemental? What were our plans? Our plans were to have 9,301 if we received the supplemental that we asked of Congress and within a few months after the merger we would have redeemed the President's pledge from 9,301, double the size of poverty, and increase VISTA

by 604 more VISTA volunteers that would have gone into the field by the end of the calendar year if we received the funds from Congress. We didn't. In fact, it was the middle of the year when the OEO bill finally went through and the VISTA \$20 million we asked for legislation on ACTION alone, it was a new agency since it had been passed by the Congress and we never got action on that.

So we are on our way now, without the supplemental we are asking for today, to putting 8,700 volunteers into the field and maintaining the VISTA programs. So the issue is, not so much how many volunteers are in the field, but what we can do if Congress either moves this bill through or acted on a supplemental in fiscal year 1972. And I know that the chairman in the Senate, I think, said some nice things about things we were able to do and about me and UYA as a good concept and his comment was he had no problem with the ACTION program so long as it does not undermine VISTA.

That is what we are trying to prove, but it is difficult when Connie Newman and Chris Mould have to operate out ahead training, with the recruiting, and so forth, when we are always uncertain of funds and had no action on the additional funds that the President has asked for.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, since ACTION has created applications for VISTA up 40 percent so our recruiters are out talking about ACTION and young people are responding to VISTA and want to join. I think that is a good sign and they are up 10 percent for the Peace Corps over a year in which it was up 50 percent. So applications continue to come forward and we are hopeful that somehow we can get our congressional picture together and get our bill through and expand all of these programs.

Mr. STEIGER. Can you or Mrs. Newman talk about those projects that were closed down in VISTA?

Mrs. NEWMAN. Yes. There were, in fact, 70 projects closed down this last year and we have in the pipeline now about 90 additional projects. But what I would like to discuss is the reason for closing them down.

We had established a criteria in VISTA pretty much building on the good of VISTA's prior two actions, building on the concept there must be a role for the poor in the planning and the responsible organizations must have an idea of what it is they want volunteers to do. There must be a specific plan for volunteers serving as catalysts, mobilizing resources in the community and then phasing out when it is evident that the community is in a position to handle the project.

Taking this into consideration, we did two things. We evaluated 45 percent of the projects and had the regions look at those projects that fell into the bottom quartile and tell us as to those which ones they felt could they redevelop in line with the new criteria and which they could not. As though those they could not, there was a joint decision to close them down.

There are only 120 volunteers on those projects and all volunteers were offered the option to transfer to another project. Now all volunteers transferred. Some determined to terminate early, so I guess in summary I would like to say we did close down 70 projects and in this year of 1972 opening up 70 new projects and components and we are contemplating opening 90 new projects in 1973.

MR. STEIGER. Would it be possible for you to submit for the committee the criteria on which the decision was made?

Mrs. NEWMAN. Yes.

(The material referred to follows:)

ACTION,

Washington, D.C., September 7, 1972.

HON. CARL PERKINS,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the course of the ACTION hearings held on August 10, Congressman William Steiger asked if we might amplify our remarks on the criteria used to terminate 70 ineffective VISTA projects over the last year. The following information is in response to this request.

By March 30, 1972, ACTION/VISTA had closed over 70 ineffective projects as part of a special effort to improve the quality of the VISTA program. It was the view of the staff that: (a) many Volunteers were serving on projects which neither increased the capacity of the poor, nor satisfied the original expectations of the Volunteers who were beginning their VISTA service; and (b) Volunteers would be better assigned to soundly conceived new projects (in fact over 70 new projects and components have been approved since July 1971).

In August/September of 1971, the Domestic Operations Evaluation Unit evaluated 159 projects (45% of the total) across the country. At about the same time the regional offices were requested to rank each of their active projects on a scale of 1 to 16. The judgments expressed in both exercises were converted by headquarters to quartile distribution. Each region in turn was asked to indicate the strategy for phasing out the bottom quartile projects and alternative plans for transfer of Volunteers. Headquarters encouraged the regions to evaluate each project in terms of its potential for meeting the new VISTA project criteria if redeveloped. Those projects showing potential were *not* closed in March, but were left open to be redeveloped and re-evaluated by October 1972.

The criteria used in evaluating 45% of the projects in August/September 1971 have been used by VISTA since 1967. (A copy of the Evaluation Form and a copy of the last Evaluation Summary are attached). The major items of concern in the evaluation were: (a) project goals and objectives; (b) involvement of the target population; (c) Volunteer supervision; (d) degree the Volunteer activities conformed to tasks outlined in the scope of work.

In determining whether the projects identified as bottom quartile should be redeveloped, the new VISTA project criteria were used as the standard. The basic features of these criteria are as follows\* (copy attached):

The sponsoring organization must:

- have a program whose primary purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty
- ensure participation of the poor
- have the capacity to develop and manage a project utilizing Volunteers
- provide a detailed description of the problem to be addressed, plus a description of constraints and resources.
- outline the goals and objectives of the activity utilizing VISTA's in time-phased, measurable terms
- ensure that the role of the Volunteers include mobilizing community resources and increasing the capacity of its own problems.

If you or any other member of your Committee desire any additional information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD, *Director.*

MR. STEIGER. To close the bottom quartile projects?

Mrs. NEWMAN. Yes. There is one point I would like to make. In the evaluation we used the old instrument for VISTA, an instrument developed in 1966 in determining which projects we would close down, and we took not only the evaluation of the old instrument, but we had the regional directors look at those projects that were in the

\*Note: The attached materials referred to are available in the files of the Committee on Education and Labor.

bottom quartile and say, as to our new criteria is it possible, even though it did not measure up as to the old instrument, to bring this project into line?

So there are two factors involved.

Mr. STEIGER. I would appreciate it very much if you made it available to the committee.

Mrs. NEWMAN. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. Now, Mr. Blatchford, in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota, the ACTION bill, you requested permanent authorization and why should ACTION have a permanent authorization rather than allowing Congress to periodically review the program?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. We are not in any way, Congressman Steiger, trying to avert congressional oversight or review. We are very happy to come and testify on any parts of our program at any time and also should we request any changes in the law, naturally we would come forward to the authorizing committee to do that in any fiscal year.

We asked for the permanent authorization because it would allow us to get out of some of the binds we have been in where I do, in fact, have to go and testify before some 13 different congressional committees on ACTION. Should we be able to move right through the authorizing part, I would just simply go forth to the Appropriations Committee and it would simplify our lives greatly in staff time and preparation; therefore, we would go forward simply when the committee asks us to and when they have any questions and want to change the laws.

And we would be able to move through the appropriations process quicker. In 3 years in Washington, I don't know of any time we actually had the money we asked for in the beginning of the year when we should start to spend it, but always on some kind of continuing resolution and should we be able to move strictly through the appropriations process of bills, I think it might speed up also our process and allow for better planning of our operation.

Mr. STEIGER. I am intrigued by that response and am sympathetic to it, though I must say in honesty we hate to lose the opportunity of having you come back on a regular basis.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I enjoy it immensely.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You say that with a straight face. I want to ask along this line, because it seems to me the point that Mr. Steiger has made, and I asked the gentleman to yield, because it seems this aspect is a very important part of what we are talking about and it is separate from the rest of the features of the bill; the rest of the features of consolidation and so on could hang together very well with a prescribed number of years. I would be interested in whether there really are any unique features about ACTION that call for this permanent creation of the program, because every agency or almost every agency might like to make the same request you made.

We have an indefinite life, just as judges would just as soon have life terms rather than having their term reviewed periodically and there are even Members of the Congress who might feel the same way, but is there anything really unique about this program except for what you have already said. Is it just that you would be free not to waste time with us?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; I have conferred with my colleagues that are heads of agencies and departments and maybe they have the same unique problems we do and maybe they don't.

Mr. DELLENBACK. But you actually make this request, however, and you have shown great courage.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. We considered our need to do some planning and good execution of programs. Last year we didn't get funds for the fiscal year beginning July until the following March 8 for international activities and until August 10 for Older Americans and December 15 for VISTA and never did get ACTION's request for the additional funds that the President asked for.

Mr. STEIGER. If you yield at that point, it does not make any difference if you have permanent or yearly appropriations, that problem is an Appropriations Committee process, not an authorizing one.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Mr. Steiger, the Congress has told us they are ready any day to move forward on our appropriations just as soon as we get an authorization. That is what we hear continually, they say, "As soon as you can get an authorization for the bill that comes up, we will put your appropriation on it."

As I say, we don't have any authorization.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We join you in this, but to set the record straight, you are talking about a situation where your authorizations are under the OEO bill and we know the struggles going on under that. If it were to be the position of Congress to come up with a separate authorization for 1, 2, or 3 years, whatever the term may be, then you are not in the hangup with OEO, but in your own special situation.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, now, we are in August, Congressman, and we don't have any action on the authorization of ACTION itself.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You don't have?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. The ACTION bill itself and yet both Committees on Appropriations are saying they are ready to move forward on our appropriation for the ACTION bill we are testifying on today should we have authorization. We are having difficulty moving it out of the Senate.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That was the bill that passed the Congress once and ran into a roadblock down the road at Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; actually this is the first hearing we have had.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I refer to the OEO authorization you are suffering from actually passed the Congress and would have been law had the President deemed fit to sign it so you are really complaining about the veto.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; because the President was wise enough to create ACTION and move these programs out of the other bureaucracies so we would not be vulnerable to it, although the first few months we were.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We are fencing, but the point is the point you just made about the inability of getting appropriations because of lack of authorization—the authorization bill passed the Congress and was vetoed.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; in which VISTA was a part, that part yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Chair will be glad to yield an additional 5 minutes in view of this discussion.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to thank him, too.

Mr. STEIGER. Let me ask a few more questions before we go further.

Mr. KEMP. Will you yield to a question that relates to that colloquy?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. Thank you.

Mr. Blatchford, how much has your budget increased in the last 2 years?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. You are referring to what we basically inherited in the merger a year ago toward what we are asking for now?

Mr. KEMP. Yes.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. In VISTA there is a total increase from \$81 million to \$98 million, or a \$17 million increase. It is an increase of \$1.5 million for VISTA and \$4 million for the University program and an increase for some new programs and a very dramatic increase for the Older Americans program. The Foster Grandparents began at \$12.5 million and we doubled it to \$25 million and Senior Volunteers began at \$5 million and we are now putting it at \$15 million, triple the size of that.

So I think we have made good on the President's pledge to increase activities.

Mr. KEMP. Thank you.

Mr. STEIGER. That brings me to the question I would ask and that is, can you break down the ACTION budget request for the domestic programs, distribution between Older Americans, the VISTA program, and other programs in the proposed budget for fiscal 1973?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I have it and would you like me to go through it or submit it?

Mr. STEIGER. Go through it briefly.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. In highlighting, I just mentioned an increase of \$1.5 million for VISTA, \$4.2 million for University Year for Action and the breakdown would be then, \$24.7 million for VISTA \$8.5 million for University Year for Action, \$25 million for Foster Grandparents, \$15 million for Senior Volunteers, \$1 million for Voluntary Action Centers in the private sector, \$2 million for working through State and local programs, State and local governmental programs, and \$3.5 million for educational programs, \$1 million for minority business programs, and these are in the new fields where we think we can innovate through the local programs, and cost-sharing programs are \$2.3 million for our past of cost-sharing and \$7 million for program support, a total of \$90 million plus the pay raise of \$526,000, would be \$90,526,000.

Mr. STEIGER. \$90,526,000 for the domestic budget?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. And the Older Americans portion, is that \$15 million for Senior Volunteers and \$25 million?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes, \$40 million for Older Americans.

Mr. STEIGER. \$40 million total for Older Americans. And the VISTA?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Approximately \$25 million for the VISTA programs not including support for them, not including recruiting support, overhead.

Mr. STEIGER. Where do we get \$55,908?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I will ask the Chief of the Budget to speak to it. We had to convert figures the way we inherited them as individual entities into breaking them down into programs and separating the programs and I would like him to answer.

Mr. STEIGER. Give me some idea of the authority.

Mr. MARKHAM. The grand total needed for domestic activities including agency support for overhead parts of the program-like accounting and administration and recruitment is \$88,425,000. We have some permanent authorization at the moment under the Small Business Act, which is a very small part, \$517,000 about, which we don't need authorization for because it is permanently authorized.

The remainder of \$97 million we need \$42 million for Older Americans, about 5 percent in addition to the \$40 million for overhead, and that leaves \$55,908,000 we need for domestic programs, which we incur under VISTA authorities and under this bill.

Mr. STEIGER. Under that authority comes then VISTA, University Year in Action, you said \$3.5 million for the educational programs?

Mr. MARKHAM. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. That comes under that authority also?

Mr. MARKHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEIGER. In what way? What is that program?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Mr. Chairman, the idea is that we would work with local school districts, boards of education, and the like to fund teacher aides, volunteer aides, paraprofessional people in education programs.

Mr. STEIGER. Under what authority are you granted that opportunity?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Under the authority we are requesting in the bill. We are requesting broadened authority for ACTION to meet all human social needs, not confined just to the OEO guidelines on poverty.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, the Administration has requested in the bill I have introduced the authority to transfer Teacher Corps, that authority has not as yet been granted?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. No; this is not related to the Teacher Corps.

Mr. STEIGER. You are then suggesting that in the bill, that there is a provision which would allow you to go into a program of teacher aides?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, I don't see it, or we don't see it anyway as competing with the Teacher Corps. It is simply expanding what some VISTA volunteers have already been doing in the educational system, but working in conjunction in the recruitment and training with local educational systems of volunteers as a part of the school system.

That is on the VISTA model. In fact, Mrs. Newman might elaborate on some of the projects we have.

Mrs. NEWMAN. I was just going to mention that we do have some VISTA volunteers now working in education programs as tutors, both for dropouts in high schools and tutors of young people who are in school and in disadvantaged areas and having difficulties. Sometimes these programs are tied to school systems and sometimes they are not. Sometimes they are tied to the Community Action Agency,

but the idea here was to continue to work with the disadvantaged, the poor, and in ways that are not being provided for under the school system presently.

Mr. STEIGER. Could you please submit to the committee and specifically me some greater detail on specifically what you have in mind?

(The material referred to follows:)

ACTION,

Washington, D.C., August 18, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: In response to Congressman William Steiger's request at the time of my appearance before the Education and Labor Committee to testify on behalf of the proposed ACTION legislation, I am pleased to give the Committee an account of ACTION's plans for development of new volunteer programs involving cooperation with educational institutions and for the development of entrepreneurship among low-income persons, especially those drawn from minority groups. This account supplements the information found on pages 2-21 and 2-21A of the *ACTION Congressional Presentation* for Fiscal Year 1973, a copy of which is enclosed.

As I indicated during the hearing, volunteers have frequently been employed as paraprofessional teacher aides and guidance assistants in schools, as well as serving, through PTA's and similar groups, as an important citizen resource to schools. ACTION believes that this process can be reversed, that schools and colleges can serve as an important mechanism for the mobilization of citizens' energies to be of service to their communities. University Year for ACTION represents one step in this direction; during FY 1973 three other approaches to the full utilization of this resource are planned.

Working with the National Association of Secondary School Principals and with several bureaus of the Office of Education, ACTION has developed preliminary plans for a limited test, during Fiscal Year 1973, of the idea that significant educational experiences at the secondary level can be designed through the creation of service opportunities in connection with the programs of appropriate antipoverty agencies. The \$9 million requested for the purposes of this test will be used to demonstrate, in at least three generally representative communities, that such service opportunities exist, that the service of high school students makes a significant contribution to the work of the agencies, and that the educational value of such service is sufficient to make such programs realistic competitors for support by school systems without specific Federal funding. No funds would be used to support educational activities as traditionally understood—for teachers' salaries, for example.

In order to meet critical shortages in the numbers of persons currently being trained for entrance into certain service professions—juvenile counselors, for example—to Office of Education has under consideration a plan to create a Service Professions Training Corps. The Training Corps would focus the efforts of students and institutions on meeting the needs for trained manpower in these areas. Students enrolled in the Corps would spend the last two years of college in specially designed educational programs, which would be supplemented, full-time during the summer vacation and part-time during the school year, by carefully supervised and organized service roles within the professions in question. Following graduation a student would be committed to a full year of full-time service at a subsistence level, as an apprentice or intern in the profession for which he had received training. ACTION has agreed with the Office of Education to service as a resource for the design of the service component of this training program—seeking out the part-time, summer, and full-year service opportunities which will bring realism into the training process in a continuous, coordinated fashion. Funds requested in the amount of \$2.1 million would provide for 480 man-years of volunteer participation. Again, no ACTION funds would be expended to support direct educational activities or to support students while enrolled in regular courses.

For three years, the National Student Volunteer Program has worked closely with VISTA as a national focus for support and encouragement of the burgeoning campus volunteer movement. The widespread enthusiasm which has greeted the

early growth of University Year for ACTION suggests that there is as yet untapped potential in the contribution which students, while enrolled in college, can make to the anti-poverty efforts of the nation. University Year for ACTION requires a full-time commitment from participants; the possibility exists that a greater return for Federal expenditures might be forthcoming if less demanding commitments were required, and funds were used to support on-the-job transportation, technical assistance and programming, rather than providing living allowances. ACTION believes that expanded support, through the National Student Volunteer Program, for campus volunteer efforts would allow a test of this idea and expects to use some of the money requested for Education Programs to achieve this test.

The development of entrepreneurial skills among low-income persons, especially those drawn from minority groups, is widely believed to be an essential element in efforts to strengthen the structure of such communities in ways which will allow them to rise above poverty. At the same time, there are often cultural and educational gaps which make it difficult for experienced businessmen, who are willing to work on a volunteer basis to assist members of such communities start and develop small businesses, to make effective use of their experience and skill while acting as counselors. Funds are therefore sought by ACTION to provide training to such volunteers, principally members of SCORE chapters located in appropriate cities and towns, and to make available technical assistance to volunteers engaged in such counseling assignments; the funds requested will provide five days of training or technical assistance to each of 2,000 volunteers.

I have enclosed some additional information about the programs of ACTION—especially SCORE and the National Student Volunteer Program, mentioned above. As you can see, ACTION is moving ahead with plans to strengthen and encourage the voluntary action movement in the United States; I look forward to the passage of H.R. 14828, which will significantly enlarge ACTION's capability to perform this important work. If there is any further information I can provide, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you at any time.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. BLATCHFORD, *Director.*

Note: The attached materials referred to are available in the files of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes. It is also a mechanism, Congressman. The President requested, and I think the bill you have supported, our ability to give grants to local groups to do the recruiting and training. It is a different mechanism for fielding volunteers and putting them into the field. We want to test and have flexibility to move away from the general Federal models of VISTA and the Peace Corps and to add onto these by giving grants to local school districts and local school associations to recruit and train volunteers to put them into the field to meet local needs.

That would be different than the way the Peace Corps has recruited, placed, and trained and the like. That is what we mean by education programs, minority business programs, a whole area of what we call new and innovative activity to give grants to attractive local groups to do the recruiting and training for us at lower cost in the field of education, but not necessarily teaching of the model of the Teachers Corps.

Mr. STEIGER. I understand that, but I would simply be interested in taking, frankly, a closer look at that concept. You also mentioned as I recall a million dollars for minority business and what is that program?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. We have gotten a number of requests from groups who are associations that deal with minority enterprises, such as the Urban League, National Business League, and other groups who want to aid the minority businesses, and they wanted field volunteers in their area and have up to \$1 million to test ways to field volunteers,

to give them grants to recruit and train volunteers aiding minority businesses, particularly volunteers from the minority community itself.

I can have Mr. Mould give an example.

Mr. MOULD. Mr. Steiger, in that instance one of the things we are trying to explore is how to deliver more technical assistance to minority contractors who have increased through the 8(A) set-aside program, which I am sure you are familiar with, getting access to bidding on Government contracts. It is a large field in which they have not had sufficient participation before. Part of the problem is back-stopping and reinforcing the ability of the minority contractor once he has the contract to produce what he contracted to produce.

Again, this would enable us to do some things in that area with some of the associations Mr. Blatchford has mentioned.

Mr. STEIGER. It would be helpful if you would be willing to supply the committee with some further details and information about that program so that at least this one member might have a chance, which brings me then to my last question, and I might add for which I am grateful for the chairman's and other member's patience.

There I have a particular interest in both the SCORE program and the ACE program and now the Minority Business program as a result of some problems that have developed with a company in Oshkosh, Wis., namely, the People's Brewery Co., and it is a program funded and supported by the Small Business Administration, and has had considerable difficulty in getting the technical assistance which supposedly goes with SBA, particularly in the accounting and other matters of that kind.

My question is, first, what kind of shared responsibilities do you work out with the Small Business Administration; and, second, what kind of an effort or what can one do to make sure that when an SBA loan is in the field, it is possible to get the resources of SCORE or ACE or both available to, in this case, an extraordinarily good black man who is the head of the People's Brewery Co., who has real problems and has had difficulty in working with the Federal Government?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. There are 187 SCORE chapters and about 5,000 SCORE volunteers around the country. Before the merger these SCORE chapters would meet, there would be an SBA man who would refer cases to them. They would bid for these cases and go out and consult on the case. We thought that their activities, so helpful on SBA loans and so forth, SCORE's technical resources could be greatly expanded. We tried to expand them into two areas, which I don't think SCORE was very active in before, minority business and in nonprofit associations.

I think we have had some good success so far in aligning them with minority and nonprofit associations. It has taken momentum and emphasis from ACTION and ACTION's staff in the field to find cases to refer them to SCORE volunteers because otherwise they are confined to the narrow process of SBA referrals.

I think that we would be interested in the case of that minority enterprise you referred to, as well as many others, and we would be glad to hear about these.

The VISTA volunteers come in contact with them constantly and come back to ACTION and we refer SCORE volunteers into some of

those areas that traditionally SBA has not been in or referral has not been made. This is a new area, of course, and we would be happy to find our SCORE chapters in Milwaukee, or whatever they are around the State and refer SCORE volunteers to that particular problem you referred to as well as any others we found in the Nation.

Mr. STEIGER. I would not wish to be subtle.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes, you have a friend in ACTION.

Mr. STEIGER. But I would suggest, if it is possible, that you proceed to follow up as soon as you can to, in fact, try to give Ted Mack the kind of help he is seeking and I think he deserves to do the job and I ask you to specifically get back in touch with me as soon as you arranged that so we might decide and determine whether or not something more is required.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I am sincere when I say the Milwaukee chapter is the best and most active one in the Nation, it really is, most responsive to ACTION and worked with the Menominee Indians in VISTA projects in Wisconsin and they have been one of the most responsive to helping in VISTA projects, in taking directions we have given them.

Mr. THOMPSON. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Kemp, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the chairman and the chairman's man for yielding some of their valuable time.

I would like to join with my colleagues, Mr. Blatchford, on the committee in welcoming you here, and I appreciate your responses and your willingness to answer these questions. I compliment you on your testimony as well as on your answers.

I am particularly interested in the University Year for Action program and you may have gone over a couple of these questions previously, but I would like to spend a few moments on it. What is the relationship between UYA and VISTA within your agency?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, as UYA began it was part of the Office of Program Policy Development, program development, and it was developed there under the capable leadership of Jerry Brady as part of that staff, and as it became an actual operating program in the field, we asked the field offices to take over responsibility for the local operations in the program when Mr. Brady was transferred to domestic operations, so it is an integral part of the agency along with VISTA, Older Americans, and the SCORE and ACE programs, and it is a component in the field and local field officers have responsibility for it.

That is a pattern that developed which we found successful.

Mr. KEMP. Are they not a little in conflict? I would appreciate some help in answering that question.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. You mean between UYA and VISTA?

Mr. KEMP. Yes.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, UYA essentially is VISTA in higher education. We are just calling on another resource that was not previously available to recruit, train, and field volunteers to fight poverty. Before we were relying on those having finished college, generally, or the poor in the community, or in their own communities to come forward and fill out an application for VISTA and join and we would put them in service.

Now, we are talking about college as an entity and you have a role to play.

Mr. KEMP. So it is a source.

Dr. BLATCHFORD. A source and mechanism for VISTA volunteers, so we go to colleges and say:

You want to play a part in VISTA, ACTION and antipoverty work, give your students credit, recruit them, train them, supervise them and we will give you technical assistance and pick up the living expenses for the volunteer for a year and open up another resource previously untapped.

Mr. KEMP. What is the reaction of the universities? Do you have hard statistics?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Let me call on Mr. Brady to do that because the Senate had the long hairs and people from the universities testify themselves.

Mr. BRADY. About three reactions, Congressman. First of all, from universities themselves, to be as precise as I can in answering your question, all of the 24 universities we have had in the program have found it not only satisfactory but quite important to the type of progress they wanted to make in relating themselves more closely to the community and in giving more relevant education.

Consequently, all of the universities asked for more volunteers and to have their programs expanded and the pressure on us surely is in the neighborhood of 3 or 4 to 1 what we can respond to just in those schools.

Secondly, more schools want in. We started calculating last night how many we would have to send invitations to bid to if we had another round, and we have well over 500 universities expressing themselves in writing on the subject, let alone any we might solicit.

So the universities have found it relevant. The program has been carried into a large number of academic departments. It has found a home there. It has particularly been used obviously in social welfare, urban studies, medicine, a large number in medicine, architecture and a lot of areas.

I would say we probably have 18 different academic departments.

Mr. KEMP. How autonomous are they at the university level? How autonomous in the academic level insofar as the different programs in which the students would engage?

Mr. BRADY. We have set very few standards. The only thing we say is we want to see that student makes normal progress toward his degree so he is not thrown off stride and has to invest another half-year or so to participate in the program.

We found that academically sound. Now, how that is done is entirely a matter of how the university wishes to do it. They may structure a new curriculum as in Nebraska or use the regular curriculum and many curriculums have field-oriented experience and independent studies and reading, so the manner in which they are chosen to be done is quite local and quite individualized and increasingly departmentalized.

Programs are coming out of architecture, environment, urban design and urban studies, social work, so the answer is it is a highly individualized and localized process.

Mr. KEMP. I am interested in expanding the publicity and conveying a greater knowledge of what you people are doing to the

community-at-large, to the country-at-large, and I have been interested in some of the television spots I have seen using sports figures to identify some voluntary drug abuse education programs. I wondered if there were anything in the works, either now or in the future, whereby you might enlist on a voluntary basis businesses, that is, professional football, or some other people that might be interested in helping convey to the public what you are doing and enlisting volunteers.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. The Advertising Council distributes our own ads which tell about the work and solicits volunteers throughout all of the media about twice a year, making up new ads, and we have an ad agency that donates its time and we have a campaign we are working on right now for the fall to tell a lot about ACTION and what it does in soliciting volunteer help.

We also have an Office for Voluntary Action in liaison communicating with businesses, nonprofit groups and others who are volunteers, to tell them about our activities. Congressman, frankly because of budget difficulties during the last year, not having authorization of funds to operate on, the first things that get cut back are things such as public affairs, advertising, recruiting and the like because we have to use all of our money to keep our volunteers in the field and we had very serious budget difficulties during the last year.

Mr. KEMP. In view of the budget difficulties and the problems that I know are yours in connection with attempting to carry out the very noble and idealistic and important programs in your agency, is there a danger in allowing programs to get started that tend not to get the attention or the budgetary support that you would want in order to adequately match our results with, frankly, the rhetoric?

I think there has been a lot of rhetoric and commend you for attempting to bridge that gap and to match the results with the rhetoric, but I wonder if there is not a danger of overproliferation of programs while having these difficulties?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, I think that we have done more, ACTION has done a lot more action than talk. In fact, I think it has been a theme of the agency and the administration that we try to go on a binge of publicity until we have something to show. I think the university is a good example.

Mr. Brady started the program with only a handful of staff people, worked rather quietly getting it done and once it is a solid program then we want to go out and talk about it and tell what it has done and tell other schools and students how to get in on it. I think that has been a general theme of the administration, to build on solid successes and not get too involved in making too much publicity before it happens.

In fact, I am always asking my staff to even suspend some of their time publicizing a little more of their activities than they do because they often neglect it, and people have to know that is the way we get support in the Congress.

Mr. KEMP. I commend you for that and I see evidence of it. I think it is an important quality that you have brought to ACTION and, as I say, I commend you for it. But is there a danger that these things could proliferate to such an extent that they would cause problems? Do you feel right now with the difficulties that you have had, with the limitations that have been imposed, that we are at a

point where we can prove their pragmatic worth and value? Do you feel adequately satisfied that we can at this time fulfill all of the hopes that we do have for these ideas?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes, I think we can, Congressman Kemp. I think we have shown that the Peace Corps, VISTA, are reasonable and viable programs and they work. We have not tried to double or triple the numbers overnight. We have tried to strengthen them by program criteria.

I think they do it. We have them in hand as far as administratively and as far as our recruiting process and as far as too many programs, Mr. Congressman, we have on the list all kinds of great ideas that we want to put into action. We have only started one, the university program, as far as all the money we have, and we started on a reasonable basis and are waiting for authorization and help from Congress to move ahead.

So we think what we have we have gotten well in hand, well-managed, and we think the applications have gone up in all of these programs and this has been the year of the older Americans and older Americans have come forward, as recognized by the Congress and the President, so we have moved very swiftly to administer it.

The biggest pressure on us has been to administer very large increases in budget for the older Americans program and move the money into good sound programs. We paid a lot of attention to that. We think we have it well in hand.

Now we are waiting to be able to put some of these new ideas into action. So we think we are ahead as far as administratively and we don't have too many programs; we have not proliferated and that with congressional action we are anxious to get some more of them started.

Mr. KEMP. Well, that is the answer to the question. I wanted it for the record. I think it is an important question, especially for the Congress, and I commend you and your agency and appreciate your very forthright testimony.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Thank you, Congressman, for your support for our programs.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Blatchford, before yielding I have something of consequence that I think should be in the record, not that what Mr. Kemp was saying is not consequential, because indeed it is. I am told in some States there is a very definite impression that VISTA volunteers may not be used in a Headstart program or child care program.

Now I would like to establish that this is an erroneous impression, that it does not arise out of any federal policy.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I am sure it does not.

Mr. THOMPSON. I know that VISTA is used in these programs but I want to make a record of your policy and ask you this: If you were to get a broader authority on foster grandparents, for instance, could they be used in Headstart and child care programs?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Absolutely. In fact, it is one of the reasons we asked for broader authority.

Mr. Chairman, if I might continue, it is our interpretation of the intent of Congress that we must maintain a narrow interpretation of the foster grandparents, having them serve only in certain institutions, so therefore we have asked, there has been a prohibition and

we are requesting, as a matter of our own policy and desire and intent, there is no prohibition on it. In fact, we think the legislation we asked for will broaden authority so we can move forward in it and having older Americans serving in these things and the like. We want more flexibility to be able to do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Carlson.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Blatchford, from what I have been reading and hearing about you, I know you have done a very commendable job and I join with my colleagues in congratulating you for what you have done to date. However, I think I would concur more with our chairman and disagree with my colleague, Mr. Steiger, on the subject of politics.

There is no law that says you cannot think politically and from what I have seen in some of the recent judicial decisions, your employees can participate to a certain degree in politics, that is, you can pursue the course of the party of your choice and so can your employees.

Now, as a matter of fact, our current Democratic candidate for Vice President, our current one, was in a similar job as you hold and I believe that his experience and his record of office probably had something to do with his being considered for his candidacy. So I would not hesitate to let the President and Vice President, if he wants to play tennis with you and hit you on the head once in a while, it might bounce back to you someday and you might be Vice President, too.

Seriously, I see very little mentioned here of the Peace Corps in your remarks here and I think probably there is every reason for not mentioning it too much. Where is it funded and who administers it and what part do you play in this program?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, the Peace Corps is the international branch of ACTION and consequently we go before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, strictly those four committees strictly on the Peace Corps Act.

And we are doing that this year. We have requested additional funds for Peace Corps volunteers, we requested \$88 million for the Peace Corps which is an increase of \$6 million over what the President—requested and an increase of \$14 million over what the Congress requested and we are moving ahead to increase the numbers.

We have started into six new countries. Our applications continue upward after a falling down for 4 or 5 years in the late sixties. It is a healthy organization and we started with 200 and some projects and there are over 700 projects now in the Peace Corps and we are delighted to testify on that.

However, we have not included it in the testimony here because we are called before the Education and Labor Committee strictly on the domestic operations of ACTION.

Mr. CARLSON. Well, in the case of the Peace Corps, whom would you ask for the money from, the Foreign Affairs Committee or this committee or what committee?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. The Foreign Affairs Committee authorized the full \$88 million that the President requested.

Mr. CARLSON. Does that mean that you administer it?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. But it is activated by the Foreign Affairs Committee, right?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Yes; it is my responsibility overall to administer the Peace Corps as well as the other programs. There is an associate director for International Operations, who handles the Peace Corps programs overseas. The Office of Citizen Placement has responsibility for the recruitment and selection of all volunteers, Peace Corps, VISTA, and the other volunteers. So that part is united.

What was before the Peace Corps, the single agency, has been broken up. Its program overseas is run by a recruitment director and VISTA is run and so on and the overall is under ACTION under my tutelage.

Mr. CARLSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I join in words of welcome. We are delighted to see you here today. I would like to follow one particular line of questioning, but before I do, let me enter a disclaimer so there will be no misconception about my being neutral in this.

I am a strong backer of VISTA, ACTION, and the Peace Corps. I think, quite frankly, some of the things that have been accomplished by these agencies are just great, so I don't start from a neutral position. My questioning is not aimed now at either giving you a soft pitch to fungo one out of the park or strike you out, but I am interested in one aspect of this particularly. It seems to me what we now have, Mr. Blatchford, is a series of diverse programs that you are administering centrally, as opposed to a real single agency doing a variety of things, is that correct?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I think we are moving from one to another. I think we began by inheriting existing programs. Our purpose is a much larger mandate that the President has given us, it is to call on all Americans to come forward to volunteer and to be able to put them into service, whether it is in one of the existing inherited programs or in the creation of a newly designed program by which they can serve to meet human needs, so we move from one which is essentially like creating a conglomerate to administer something but not just to administer, but our mandate is to search out and find new ways for voluntary services and have an overall agency which is a step toward a kind of commitment of service by this Nation and being the one single agency to put it into effect.

So we see ourselves as an agency concerned with volunteers throughout the Federal Government, throughout the whole of our citizenry, people who want to spend a year at least serving and when they come forward or when the requests come forward, it is up to us to put them to work on the job. We don't see ourselves just as administering existing programs.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Well, the point I am getting at, as to this legislation which is before us, I can see at least three different aspects that inquiries could go off on. One, we could go off on the question that Mr. Steiger and I were engaging in a few minutes ago on the question of indefinite authorization and, quite frankly, I am not supportive of it. I think it would be a mistake. I don't mean we ought to authorize you from year to year. I think that would also be a mistake, because when each year you don't know what is going to

happen the next year, you are in no position to have sound constructive programs.

What seems to me the soundest road for the Congress to walk is to have multiple-year operations so you can look down the pike several years, two or three, and say, "All right, we can start something and continue." I think that is a sound middle ground that makes good sense between year-by-year living on the edge of a sword and having an indefinite authorization where only sporadically you can come back to us.

We will move that issue aside though. Then we can have two other aspects of this. One is to attack or chip away on or tear apart the individual programs that you are administering and that is where my disclaimer entered. Basically, I am perfectly willing to recognize, and the record will bear this out, that there are imperfections in what has been done. I think Mrs. Newman will say this or anyone who administers any aspect of this, if you are going to be realistic, that you are going to have to start from the situation of not being over-defensive because none of the programs are perfect. Mistakes are made and we have local areas where the wrong things have been done and we have areas where things should have been done and were not done. I recognize that foes and opponents of the programs can find those imperfections, but I think it is a serious mistake to generalize on the specific and tear down the program because you can find that inside of the program a mistake was made.

I think if you look at each of the programs in balance, with any sort of objectivity, we come to the conclusion that the programs are good programs and they have done a great deal of good and far more good than harm. Putting that one aside also and staying in the middle, it seems to me that the heart of this bill is to permit you to take what has been the piecemeal declaration of congressional purpose in the various pieces of legislation that you deal with, such as OEO, Small Business, and the Older Americans Act. We have the component parts and we are taking these bricks that have been created a brick at a time and build them into a solid wall now.

That was the thrust of the question about the central administration of individual programs versus really creating a single program that blends all of the component parts and that is the question I really put to you, and again it is not an attack on you. Are you not finding yourself somewhat handicapped by the fact that when you deal with VISTA you have one set of criteria annual figures and when you deal with the Peace Corps you have another set and when you deal with some of the other component parts, you have individual qualifications that don't blend together? Is this not the fact?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Well, we find that in our first year it is something we face, you are absolutely correct because that is what we do, in fact, face.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Fine. Let me stop you before you disclaim. You needn't be on the defensive; you said what I want you to say. You find, as you try to put the programs together, you are trying to put together pieces that were not machined to go together, they were machined separately?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What you are coming to us to suggest is that if we are going to make them work at their optimum, it is imperative we structure them legislatively into a single program, isn't that the case?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Exactly.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That is a major share of what you are here proposing to us.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The only reason, frankly, in my mind why we should not be dealing with the international aspects, as well as the national, is a congressional problem and not really an administrative problem?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You can't come to this committee and deal with the Peace Corps because of the fact that our jurisdictional limitation keeps the Peace Corps somewhere else.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I wish it were possible congressionally for us to deal with the whole package and in one committee like the one dealing with VISTA and Peace Corps and et cetera, and et cetera, but you have broken it down, I think, on a pragmatic legislative ground.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So I don't go off onto that aspect of it, but dealing with just the domestic ones, and let me ask a couple of wrap-up questions on this.

Do I read correctly in your statement, in the thrust of the bill, and in the report that is before us from your agency, that you feel you could do a considerably better job of implementing the established congressional purposes if we were to package this thing into this kind of a single authorization instead of having to deal with a series of individual congressional mandates?

Mr. BLATCHFORD. I agree absolutely, Congressman. I think to the extent you could prevail on your colleagues to allow that to happen, we would be glad to give you every assistance and information, because we are trying to manage programs with people and the President decided it would be better to manage them and give them more opportunity to pull from an administrative viewpoint, all of them together, but from a congressional standpoint clearly we are not together.

Mr. DELLENBACK. There are only certain things the President can do in the way of delegation and giving you responsibilities and I think that what you are doing is a good step in the right direction, but it seems to me that it is now up to the Congress to put together these individual programs into a single authorization and break down the somewhat artificial barriers that exist between the various component parts of what you do, at least to the maximum degree that this committee has the authority and power to do so.

And I read you as requesting that of us and I read that as the principal request of this bill and it to me makes good sense. Even if we go off on specific modifications of the kind we talked of, of limited term authorization, say, for a certain number of years, the basic thrust of what you come to us on is sound and I hope this committee is going to be able to act affirmatively.

Thank you very much, all of you, for coming.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Blatchford and those accompanying you, for your responsiveness. I refuse to yield any more to the gentleman from Wisconsin to continue a discussion of vetoes of congressional legislation. If there were such discussion, we would stay a little longer, but I don't think we want to do that.

We have a good record on that now.

With that, the committee will adjourn, with thanks to you, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. BLATCHFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m. the committee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

○





