

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Apparently both of us believe strongly in the involvement of the poor and the concept of community action. The Office of Economic Opportunity only administers about \$1.6 billion and hopes to get now about \$2 billion to administer. However, \$30 billion, give or take some, is being administered by the Federal Government for people in poverty and other agencies and departments. Do you believe that the community action concept ought to spread to other programs like housing for the poor, health programs for the poor, and other education programs for the poor?

Dr. FLEMMING. Congressman Quie, I certainly do, and I would hope that the kind of experiences that we are having with the Economic Opportunity Act would demonstrate the soundness and the necessity of this kind of an approach and that this would lead to the amendment of some of the existing laws to make provision for this approach. I agree with you wholeheartedly on that.

Mr. QUIE. Then, at least the purpose that motivates those of us who have introduced the Opportunity Crusade is agreed upon by you—but not the method by which we are trying to do it—but in the purposes we are trying to achieve in taking those steps toward that direction.

Dr. FLEMMING. I have read both bills. I go back to the statement I made earlier. It seems to me there is agreement on objectives, on a good many of the basic objectives. I think this is a great thing for the country but the disagreement obviously comes on organizational matters and also on methods.

I don't think that I would agree with your approach on the level of the effort. I recognize that you feel that if the kind of approach you have outlined were taken that you could bring some State money into the picture that in turn would have the effect possibly of moving it from \$2.1 billion to \$2.4 billion.

Mr. QUIE. Private enterprise money, too?

Dr. FLEMMING. Yes, and private enterprise money, too.

My own feeling is that as far as the Federal Government's involvement is concerned and the position taken by the national board is sound that it should be at least \$2.1 billion and I would hope the Congress would take a look at that figure as an authorization figure.

I do believe that by the approach that the Office of Economic Opportunity has taken and the approach envisaged in the act, I gather you had the same thing in mind. We can't to those resources by stimulating involvement on the part of State and local government and on the part of private enterprise and on the part of the great volunteer organizations of this country. This is one of our great resources, as I see it, including the churches as well as other private organizations.

But, to the extent that you and your colleagues desire to stimulate, strengthen, and improve the community action approach I am in complete agreement. I feel you could do this better over the period of the next 2 to 3 years, let's say, by staying with your existing organizational structure instead of trying to break it up.

My own rule of thumb would be that we ought to stay basically with the approach that the Congress decided on in 1964 for 5 years and then evaluate and see whether you want to keep everything there or whether you want to transfer some things, and so on. But I think it is almost impossible to make a truly effective evaluation short of that time in terms of its longrun impact.