Chairman PERKINS. What is your comment, Mr. Vanik?

Mr. VANIK. I would like to add to my colleague's statement by saying that I feel the centralized responsibility for this program has been perhaps the greatest factor contributing to its success and simply by dispersing the sources of help in this program would involve tying all of us up in the bureaucratic details that we have sort of brought together in the OEO program.

I think we have been afforded through the OEO program an opportunity to focalize and to direct our appeals to a central place and that was the whole idea of it.

I think this is the proven success of the program.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel, Mr. Vanik, from your statement, that so many youngsters in the city of Cleveland are being deprived of taking advantage of the present programs because of the present income levels?

Mr. VANIK. $3,200 is unrealistic for a family of four. It may be different in rural areas but in my city that income is far below what it takes to support and keep a family decently.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to compliment both of you gentlemen. I think I stated at the outset that you were the first members who had come before the committee. We hope many other members will come before the committee in the future.

Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Do either of you support the movement of the delegation of programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity to existing agencies?

Mr. VANIK. Do you mean the Neighborhood Youth Corps and so on?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I think there has to be a coordinating agency, Mr. Quie. The war on poverty crosses so many jurisdictional lines. If there are poor in the rural areas, the Department of Agriculture may be involved; the Department of Housing may be involved in curing slum conditions; and the Department of Labor may be involved in the manpower and training. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare might be involved in other programs. The only way this program can be made rational is to have all of this within an agency with central authority.

In my own city we had to bring in people from the board of education, from the Catholic Diocese, from labor and business, from the city government, from the county, all working together, cutting across normal bureaucratic jurisdictional lines.

I think this group at the local level must have one agency to deal with at the Federal level rather than five or six. I don't believe it would be workable otherwise.

Mr. VANIK. I would supplement that answer by stating in my opinion the real enemies of the OEO have been the dismal bureaucrats who resented the prodding and the pushing and the shoving which the program has brought about.

I think this is one of the purposes of the OEO to give us an independent arm, a free arm toward the approach of poverty utilizing all resources of the Government but being self-reliant in developing its own policy.