I assume we can find this agreement on both sides of the aisle, as far as I know you don't require that you have 33 percent of the poor sitting in on the formulation of those programs. Do you?

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, we do, yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do they sit in on the formulation of curricula and such things?

Mr. SHRIVER. No. That isn't what we talk about when we talk about involvement of the poor. I have tried on a number of occasions here to indicate that we think our program should involve the poor in a great many different ways. In Headstart we have a huge number of poor people serving on advisory committees to Headstart. We a large number of poor people employed not just doing menial work in Headstart but participating in the classroom so that involvement of the poor is different.

With respect to the formulation of what ought to go into Headstart, yes, we use the poor because the poor was one of the groups most vocal about participation. We had an idea that that was good but they are the ones who have been pushing the strongest so that their contribution is excellent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I commend you for the fact that you try to get poor people involved in programs. For instance, your insistence on bringing people from the communities into the Headstart program is commendable. The point I raise here is whether or not your agency hasn't become obsessed with the idea. The language that you have in the bill before us strongly recommends or suggests that you are even thinking of having these people actually elected to these positions, whatever democratic process means, and I take it to mean only one thing, elections. The question is whether or not the whole program across the country has not been slowed down in many areas simply because of the insistence that these ratios be maintained in the basic planning. I would think that wherever the poor can make a substantial contribution they ought to be in on the planning and ought to be invited and ought to be part of the program. But I don't think the program should be held up until that criterion is met because I must tell you that I can't find any place in the bill any language that justifies that guideline.

The only language that I can find in the bill is "maximum feasible participation of residents of the area." It does not say "poor." Your agency in the last 3 years has taken that language to mean all sorts of things on which there isn't a word of testimony in all of the hearings.

Mr. GOODELL. Do you want a defense, Mr. Shriver? I would be glad to volunteer.

Mr. SHRIVER. Actually, the law says that one-third of the people of the local community action agency must be residents of the area and members of the groups to be served.

Now, in applying from our point of view those two phrases it means they had to be persons who were being served by our programs and by definition are poor so that the slight-of-hand or the phraseology came in of the poor. Technically, we say all the time that it should be residents of the area; members of the groups to be served. That is all that we have done and the law says that.