

States to have. One was about nutrition, another about the kind of teaching equipment you needed, or materials in the headstart program. We had to pay for all of that out of our money.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand that informational pamphlets have to go out but it seems to me that \$2.4 million is an excessive amount of money for public relations for an agency that size.

Mr. SHRIVER. We would be delighted to have the amount of money that we spend for that purpose up here for a complete analysis by this committee where the men in charge of it will show you everything that is being spent, who gets paid, and then I think you can compare that with the expenditures for any agency of the U.S. Government, any private business, or the Red Cross, or any other agency.

Mr. GOODELL. May I have just 1 more minute, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection so ordered.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason for our concern about this is that many of us feel exaggerated statements of results accomplish nothing constructive at all. This concern has been shared by many conscientious observers including Haynes Johnson of the Washington Star who wrote articles on the poverty program. He said:

The program has suffered from too much and too effective salesmanship. As a consequence, it is, in part, a captive of its own promises.

I could give you a number of quotes from other people who basically favor the war on poverty. In a war on poverty it seems to me it furthers no one's cause to exaggerate and go through a ballyhoo routine which points up and exaggerates alleged good features and leaves out the bad features. As a matter of fact, I have before me an article in which this problem is discussed and an OEO information staff member is quoted.

Chairman PERKINS. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding another 2 minutes?

Mr. GOODELL. I only need 10 seconds, Mr. Chairman, unless he wants to answer. An OEO information staffer says that: "With Sarge when something goes wrong with the program you step up public relations." Unfortunately there are a good many times when legitimate, constructive criticism has been made and each time it does seem that the thin-skinned reaction is almost a flashback. OEO denies everything and then comes through with great exaggerated claims for what has been done. There have been a number of cases where the poor themselves have risen up and objected to this kind of high promise which far exceeds performance.

Mr. SHRIVER. I will just respond by saying that first of all we welcome the criticism whenever it is constructive. Second, we have not exaggerated our claims for success but, in fact, have minimized it. With Project Headstart we have only reached 32 percent of the kids eligible. In other programs we are very, very low in terms of reaching the people who should be reached by the program, so that I would like to say for the record that we are interested in constructive criticism. We are not exaggerating what we have done. We do try to dramatize the needs and will continue to, because the needs of the poor are always overlooked and their needs need to be dramatized. That is where we are concentrating our effort.

Mr. GOODELL. We have heard these claims about 4 million of the poor touched or 8 million touched or affected by this program, technically