

Mr. HOLMES. To assist in this war on poverty. We were instrumental. We lobbied in Hartford and joined forces with other groups who were interested in getting the State of Connecticut to commit itself to the eradication of poverty.

Mr. QUIE. Has it had any effect on improving some community action boards to involve more people from the council? Have you done any work on this?

Mr. HOLMES. The fact that we are here, the agencies are not scattered around. We hope to continue our effort as an organization.

Mr. QUIE. Let me point out a comment on the reduction in money, that \$3.39 billion evidently was what the Office of Economic Opportunity felt was needed but the Bureau of the Budget or Executive Branch scaled that down to \$1,750 million. This is what the Congress was requested to appropriate. Then Congress scaled that down by another \$130 million to \$1,062 million. So the Bureau of the Budget knocked out \$1,640 million while the Congress knocked out \$130 million. So I would say that the greatest blame is on the Bureau of the Budget and not on the Congress for the reduction.

I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BELL. I have just a couple of questions. Mr. Holmes, I note that on page 3 of your statement you refer to the fact that you believe the OEO should be retained. Then you go on to discuss the maximum flexibility in funding and so forth. But you do believe OEO should be retained; is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. That is correct.

Mr. BELL. On page 2 you state that there are those who will try to reduce the \$2.06 billion authorization. My question is really twofold. I assume by your statement that you think that amount should be retained and that you have feeling there are some who want to get rid of OEO; is that right?

Mr. HOLMES. That is correct.

Mr. BELL. Do you feel that those are the same people who you mentioned will try to reduce the amount to OEO?

Mr. HOLMES. No, that is not the intention.

Mr. BELL. It has no connection?

Mr. HOLMES. No.

Mr. BELL. The reason I brought that question up, Mr. Holmes, is that I am sure you have heard of the Opportunity Crusade, whose authors are Mr. Quie, and Mr. Goodell. I want to make it clear that there is no dollar reduction in that substitute amendment.

As a matter of fact, if anything it would increase the amount. If the OEO should be abolished by an amendment, it would be for the purpose of making the poverty program more efficient.

I wanted to clarify that because I feel some people think that this amendment is an attempt to kill or hurt the poverty program. It is not at all. I note that there has been some publicity about your committee, the political activities of your staff and the fact that some of you became worried about it and passed a ruling as to the political rights of poverty program staff members.

Was there any particular experience you might have had that caused you to take that action?

Mr. HOLMES. No personal experience. I have a strong feeling from the personal standpoint, a true fight on poverty should be strictly on