that community we learned that the Children's Bureau was about to start a children's center for a poor community nearby. We got together at the initiation of some of the local health authorities with the Children's Bureau authorities here in Washington and made this

proposition.

We said rather than have one center that serves the entire family and another center that concentrates on children, why don't we work together and make them both comprehensive centers where the Children's Bureau funds would pick up the cost of the children in our center and we would pick up the cost of the adults in another center. That was agreed to. It has been done.

We now have two comprehensive neighborhood health centers and by the efficiency that was brought about by that coordination we have 11 other centers, and Denver is the first place where we will have

citywide coverage for the poor.

Mr. Pucinski. I am glad you brought that out because here is the real heart of the poverty program, the fact that you people were able to bring all of the resources of the country together and organize an effective program.

I think that this is the point that is so often lost in discussion of

the poverty program.

Mr. Quie. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Pucinski. I yield.

Mr. Quie. If community action was in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, what would have prevented you from doing

the same thing?

Dr. English. Well, sir, that is a difficult question to answer. I think the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been doing all it can. I think what we are learning in the poverty program is that it hasn't been enough. I think this legislation permits us to do some new things to work with them.

The one thing we are sure of is that we have a long way to go in meeting the health needs of the poor.

Mr. Quie. You haven't answered what would have prevented you, if community action were within Health, Education, and Welfare?
Mr. Shriver. The answer is like saying: "What if Edison didn't in-

vent the electric light, or if he hadn't, would someone else have?" You can't say it would have worked someplace else. The point is that it is working where it is.

Mr. Pucinski. Isn't it a fact, as was stated in the letter from Kane County, HEW has a very broad mission cutting across many functions. Your mission is a specific mission of bringing health to the 32

million people in poverty in this country.

Mr. Shriver. That is correct. I have said that a number of times, including in my opening statement. We have, let's say, 2,500 people working at our place. If you could take 2,500 people out of HEW or Labor and say:

Your only job is the poor, don't think about education of the rich, don't worry about health of the rich, don't worry about anything but the poor.

They could do as well, maybe better. It is because we have a single objective which is the poor that there is at our place an atmosphere of concentration on that to the exclusion of conflicting loyalties to other