

August 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10379

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

5. You, as Director, failed to notify me, as Governor of Alabama, within five days of the receipt of the application in this case, as required by Section 209(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

6. You, as Director, failed to notify the Community Action Agencies in Dallas and Monroe Counties within five days of the receipt of the application, as required by Section 209(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

7. The organizational structure of the Board of Directors violates the guidelines laid down by the Office of Economic Opportunity itself and required by the Office of Economic Opportunity in other programs or grants within the State of Alabama.

8. There is abundant evidence available which shows the link between this group and the violent "Black Power" organization—Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, whose leaders called for the assassination of me, my husband and my child here in Montgomery on June 13, 1967.

9. This project represents a duplication of efforts and services now being rendered by the Cooperative Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration.

10. The project is doomed to fail because of the lack of qualified personnel and recognized methods.

11. A vegetable production and marketing program is presently being conducted with limited resource farmers in the ten-county area covered by the grant.

12. There are no statements of qualifications of the personnel who will direct the program and the salaries paid are completely out of line with those paid for people handling similar positions in both governmental and private employment, who have had years and years of specialized training.

13. A workable proposal was submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity which would have accomplished the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, if it had been approved.

14. I am reliably informed that funding of this group was "guaranteed" by your office in February before the organization was incorporated in March, just a few days before the grant was approved.

These are general reasons, Mr. Shriver, why this program was ill-conceived and why you as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity should not waste the taxpayers' money on a project some of your own people have said is bound to fail.

Senators Lister Hill and John Sparkman and several of the Congressmen from Alabama personally appeared before personnel in your office to object to this particular grant.

Ralph Swofford, Director of the Alabama Advisory Committee for Economic Opportunity and former Commander of the Air University and a retired Lieutenant General of the United States Air Force, also appeared before your personnel and registered objections to this grant.

Several local elected public officials also appeared in opposition to this grant.

Mr. Shriver, your Regional Director, Mr. Frank Sloan, came by the office recently and expressed a desire to cooperate with State officials in the carrying out of the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act. I have received much correspondence from several Federal Cabinet officials recently also along the same line.

To foster good Federal-State relations, it is necessary to consider the desires of local governmental officials. I have consistently waived my right to veto Office of Economic Opportunity projects in those instances where local officials make such a request.

The local officials in the affected areas here are very much opposed to this particular grant. The overriding of my veto can only help to tear down the spirit of cooperation in carrying out the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act by these and other State officials.

I consider this grant to be unwise and shall use the power of my office to prevent the waste of our money on the project and to examine all Office of Economic Opportunity projects in the State very carefully. Needless to say, I will call the attention of Congress to the whole matter and request a full Congressional investigation. Our evidence is too strong in this case to let our country down by not presenting the truth to Congress and the people.

To further substantiate my earlier reasons, I am enclosing a progress report of the Cooperative Extension Service of Auburn University which shows what has been and is being done in this ten-county area.

Furthermore, in an effort to determine if agricultural credit was available to small farmers in these ten counties, I contacted Mr. R. C. "Red" Bamberg, State Director, Farmers Home Administration, since this agency has a particular responsibility to farmers with limited resources who are unable to secure needed credit from banks, PCA, advancing merchants, or other local sources of credit.

Mr. Bamberg informs me that FHA has, through the years, made loans to small farmers in this area for producing okra, peas, squash, corn and cucumbers. Most of these crops have been grown under contract with King Pharr Canning Company, Uniontown, Alabama, and Whitfield Pickle Company, Montgomery, Alabama. These processors maintain buying and grading stations in various communities in these counties for the convenience of the grower and will add other stations whenever the interest and volume will justify. Also, a few of the more aggressive and energetic producers have sold their crops locally, and some have established retail routes and sold these crops along with potatoes, syrup, eggs and other items they produced for fresh market consumption.

Mr. Bamberg has also advised me that FHA has again this year advanced funds for vegetable production to applicants in the entire SWAFCA area who have markets or contracts for the disposition of their crops. In addition to advancing credit, the FHA gives their borrowers management assistance which includes advice on recommended varieties, planting dates, fertilizer requirements, insect and disease control, and other help that many small farmers need.

In view of the fact that FHA has made loans to farmers in all these counties, and still has funds available, it is obvious that those farmers with a reasonably sound farming operation could get needed credit here or from other sources in the area. Mr. Bamberg stated that some applications had been received from rural people living in these counties who do not have land available to them and, of course, operating loans could not be approved for this type applicant.

For your information also I am enclosing requests I have received to veto this grant.

In order to give the people of the United States the right to know what has happened in this case, I respectfully ask that you open your books and records to the people and the press. Our records are public and available to any member of the press desiring to check out what we have done in connection with this proposed grant.

With reference to your telegram of June 15, 1967, requiring that I give you my reasons for veto by June 16, 1967, the next day, I would like for you to know that these reasons would have come forward to you prior

to this time if it had not been necessary for my office to complete an extensive investigation which should have been handled by you.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LURLEEN B. WALLACE,
Governor of Alabama.

File: 100

AMEND IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

(Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend section 203(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act—8 United States Code 1153(a)—in order to allow any fifth-preference aliens—brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and their spouses and children—whose visa petition was filed prior to July 1, 1966, to be deemed to be immediate relatives within the meaning of section 201(b) of that act.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of State has informed me that approximately 100,000 fifth-preference Italians are awaiting visa issuance. Because of the limitation on immigration from Italy due to the quota system, the Department is only able to process those who have registered for visas under the fifth-preference category on or before March 1, 1955. Italy is the only country experiencing such a large backlog, and it is obvious that the majority of these people will not be able to join their families in this country for many years if the present system is maintained.

Almost 2 years ago, I rose in support of H.R. 2580, which became Public Law 89-236, the amended Immigration and Nationality Act. At that time, I said:

The worst aspect of this (quota) system is that it often prohibits the reuniting of families. Though Congress has been most generous and sympathetic in enacting special legislation to correct these problems, the fact remains that the immigration policy of the United States creates human pressures and personal hardships which need not be created.

Although that great piece of legislation became law, inequities still remain. I urge that my bill, and that of my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], will receive favorable consideration by the House.

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CONYERS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CONYERS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE AMENDED CRIME CONTROL BILL

(Mr. RANDALL (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of a day or two we can now consider in retrospect the action of the House on the crime bill. Some of us who supported the amending process now feel more than ever that a better result was achieved than if the bill had been passed in the exact content as it came to the floor of the House.

Recalling the words in the crime message of the President, sent to Congress last February, he stated at the very beginning of his message that—

The principal responsibility for dealing with crime does not lie with the National Government, but with the States and local communities.

He went on to point out, however, that, since the Federal Government had involved itself in the field of education and public health, it should now pay increasing attention to its role in the control of crime by accepting some responsibility, particularly to augment State and local efforts.

In rereading the President's message which you may recall was followed 2 days later by the introduction of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, the President emphasized the several separate themes contained in the National Crime Commission report, including:

Crime prevention.

Improvement of our system of criminal justice leading to respect and cooperation of all citizens.

Better trained people such as special police, probation, and parole officers and group counselors.

Better correctional systems applying to offenders of all ages.

Broader research and improved analysis of statistics to determine the effectiveness of various police and correctional procedures.

Substantially greater resources, meaning more funds for law enforcement.

I noted particularly that following the list the President emphasized again "the Federal Government must not and will not try to dominate the criminal justice system." He went on to say that our system of law enforcement is essentially local, based on local initiative and control by local officials.

Notwithstanding these reassurances, the House Judiciary Committee proceeded to report out a bill that left some doubts and fears among many of us that the lofty pronouncements of the President had not been spelled out with sufficient clarity in the bill.

As the general debate proceeded, it became quite apparent in the minds of many Members, that there was a concern as to whether this bill was specific enough upon the prevention and the control of riots. As I look back now in retrospect, there is no doubt but that Newark and Detroit and other riots made it mandatory that this measure not be con-

cerned only with organized crime, but contain specific language which had to be added to the measure to provide for the strict and sharp enforcement of the provisions in the bill designed to curb racial rioting. In the very words of one of the amendments, "Programs and projects dealing with riots and violent civil disorders shall be given the highest priority."

We were assured by some on the committee that the original context of the bill could apply to the prevention and control of riots. The word "could" was not impressive enough for many of us. As one who supported the key amendment and those other amendments stressing riot control, I am sure we have now a better act than if these specifics had been omitted from the language of the bill.

While our mail was quite substantial and most favorable toward the recent antiriot legislation, the concern of our constituents as to the crime bill was limited to the matter of potential Federal control over the law enforcement authorities of our cities and States. In other words, they feared the creation of a Federal police force. It is for this very reason the amendments that would give our Governors a voice are so very important, and even a necessity before many of us could support the bill, as amended, on final passage.

Those who prefer to say the amended measure contains a Governor's veto over the bill's programs or allotments are both unfair and inaccurate. Those who argue the State governments have no expertise or personnel to tackle crime problems miss the point when they insist all law enforcement problems are local, by that meaning, cities or counties with their chiefs of police and sheriffs. The strong point of the major amendment that was adopted was to give the States the opportunity or the privilege to develop a plan or program of improved law enforcement. Then, and only after their failure to develop a plan or a program, could the Attorney General make allotments directly with the local areas. This is an altogether different approach from permitting the Attorney General to establish all of the regulations or guidelines and proceed to deal directly with the local areas, many of which might be excluded from consideration at the sole discretion of the Attorney General, who after all is an appointed official.

As the bill was passed, there is a provision for every State to receive a specific allotment. Only when that State fails or omits to develop a plan would it lose its right to participate in the specific formula for allocation. Even so, under such a state of affairs the cities within the State under the terms of an amendment would not lose, because the Attorney General could allocate funds to local areas after a State has shown that it did not intend to draft a plan or a program that would qualify it for allocation of Federal funds. As finally passed, the grants would be distributed through the State agencies to local communities, giving the States the chance to develop a program or plan, but if they fail the grants would be distributed directly to

local law enforcement departments. This is a significant as well as a most welcome improvement over the bill as originally written.

Much fun was poked at the recent antiriot bill. There was a lot of laughter and some comedy made of its enactment by the would-be funny men. But these comics will have a hard time laughing off a bill so specific and so meaningful as the bill enacted on Tuesday of this week. More than this, the authorization was increased from \$50 million to \$75 million and \$25 million earmarked to assist State and local authorities in prevention, detection, and control of riots.

Much has been written since the riots in our several cities. One school of thought is: These disturbances, as well as organized crime, cannot be reduced until we have found and corrected the social ills which produce these disturbances. Another and more severe minded school of thought believes and asserts that because of these riots and the great wave of organized crime we have only two choices between continuing as a lawless nation on the one hand and being willing to put up with a police state on the other hand. Both of these views are too extreme. A much more progressive approach is the bill that the House enacted last Tuesday which will improve the efficiency of law enforcement and criminal justice through effective programs that not only will discourage violations of the criminal law but rehabilitate offenders. The main objective is to improve training techniques through development of new methods and wider and better use of methods already proved successful.

The fear for Federal control should now be quieted because the bill specifically provides that the Federal Government is prohibited from paying State and local police salaries except persons engaged in training and who perform innovative functions. For the Federal Government to pay any part of State and local police salary is involvement that is unwise and unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, among the correspondence addressed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee are communications from police chiefs and sheriffs in the area of the country I am privileged to represent. The content of some of their writing is that crime will not go away merely because we might "tell it to." We all know that law enforcement needs a determined effort but we also know it needs the proper tools for implementation. The crime bill that was passed last Tuesday can be for those who supported the Antiriot Act an answer to our critics that the House of Representatives has spoken out of clearly and plainly that it intends to give the tools to our law enforcement agencies to do a good job. For those who laughed about the antiriot bill, let them now try to be funny about the passage of this bill.

The fact of the matter is the House passed out a stiff package of anticrime and riot control legislation. The best way to describe it is to say it provides for a State-controlled law enforcement program with an emphasis on Federal