

rollees are assured a significant role in the Board structure itself, in the actual operation, and in the relations with the rest of the community.

By building within all these programs paid positions for poor persons to voice the concerns of the recipient—the pupil, the patient, the client—we are in effect enfranchising the poor, providing a role and a voice in affairs which shape their lives directly—but which never appear on any ballot at election time.

These illustrations are representative of a total endeavor to make democracy work more effectively than ever.

The word must go out—and it must go out unmistakably—that token participation is unacceptable. In the process of tightening up procedures, of improving reporting systems, or tidying up administrative details, we must not lose sight of our overriding mission.

If our program is to maintain its catalytic effect, if it is to continue to engender greater responsiveness to the needs of the poor throughout governmental and private agencies, then we must not permit our programs to suffer from hardening of the arteries.

We cannot promise the poor wealth and opportunity today, tomorrow, or even the next day. But we can continue to develop new and promising ways for involving the poor in *all* our programs. The four projects described above are merely illustrative of four *new* ways developed or promoted by OEO within the last six months.

Let us continue to act in accordance with our mandate by devising new and effective ways for democracy to come alive in all our programs. Only thus can we maintain faith with our charter.

SARGENT SHRIVER, *Director*.

Mr. SHRIVER. It expresses why we think it is important and why it has been worth the effort to get the poor involved.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would say though, that the most important function, in my judgment, of the OEO—and you have done a good job in many aspects—is to make sure that at the end of the line there is something waiting for this person, that you can help him. The only shortcoming of the OEO program in my judgment is that in too many instances at the end of the line of whatever program we had when this individual was exposed to, when it is all over, this is not true.

Many of your people have been engaged in trying to get this maximum involvement of the poor in the planning rather than helping the poor themselves. That is my only objection to the program.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Scherle.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment relative to this? It was because of the fact that some people felt that there wasn't enough at the end of the line, as I think Congressman Pucinski just phrased it, that we were hoping that by going through these programs, program by program, the members of the committee could get a better idea, and we also could get the benefit of your comments as to what is at the end of the line. A health center is at the end of the line in Watts. It wasn't there a year ago. These are the things that are at the end of the line. I was hoping, Mr. Chairman, if you would permit us, to proceed with those integral parts of the program which constitute what is at the end of the line.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, we are all going to have to vote so that I will just take time for one question for Dr. English.

Doctor, is it still the policy of the OEO to use Gestapo methods in bludgeoning members of the medical profession into participating in your program in your neighborhood health centers, as apparently has taken place in the legal services?

Dr. ENGLISH. Sir, I am not aware of that kind of tactic in any of our programs. I just might say this: that the president of the American