

It is not implied that we must penalize the poor in the interest of a free society. A society cannot be free with huge numbers of poor people. But we must carefully choose our tools and find those which can be used to eradicate poverty and build a free society.

In the current crisis of grinding poverty amid highly visible affluence, the immediate alternatives seem clear:

We can establish new crash programs and temporary task forces, pumping money into urban and rural ghettos through public programs and institutions which have thus far failed to move toward solutions. This might be called the "cooling out process," or the "temporary relief syndrone."

We can greatly step up our police activities, deciding that the basic task is one of repression. In so doing we can prepare for a lengthy period of guerilla activities among the more militant poor.

We can proceed to help build local communities and neighborhoods, consistent with the needs and aspirations of their residents, making available the kinds and volume of resources necessary, and making certain those resources are used in a self-help process—not superimposed on the people and not used as the instruments of those who would detract from and pervert the process of self-help.

Obviously, we opt for the third alternative. And we believe of all the Federal agencies, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the community action program in particular, represent the soundest approach to reach this goal.

The philosophy of the community action approach is creative, dynamic, and democratic. What should be done is not to weaken that program, but constantly seek to improve it, demanding levels of performance consistent with the terrible need that is upon this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I did not hear all of your testimony. First of all I would like to pay my respects to this group and to Walter Reuther's leadership. From the beginning it has shown a very enlightened attitude toward the whole program.

I am also in agreement with you in terms of the dollars spent. I don't know how we can wage a successful war on poverty if we are unwilling in other programs—education, and so on—to make the kind of investment that has a reasonable chance of paying off.

As I understand your statement, you would not make any change at all in the organization in the Office of Economic Opportunity. You would leave this intact?

Mr. BOONE. We would leave the Office of Economic Opportunity intact, believing that any changes which could or should be made could be made as a matter of executive or administrative discretion. That is to say that we see already that the Office of Economic Opportunity has delegated some programs to other agencies, probably most noteworthy is the Kennedy-Javits amendments program. These kinds of procedures by the Office of Economic Opportunity obviously take place under administrative and executive decisionmaking and discretion. We see that if there are to be further moves in that direction, this can be separate and distinct action from congressional action.

Mrs. GREEN. I am at a loss to understand the very inflexible position of this group and others that the Office of Economic Opportunity