

even with substantial expenditures of money. By the war on poverty I don't mean the \$1,600,000,000 we spent last year, but the addition as well. Even though we have not won the war in Vietnam or did we win the war in Korea with the high expenditures, an armistice is pretty well accepted since the Defense Department has preferred to make a better Military Establishment and have it better coordinated than the one before.

You used the reference to the Defense Department saying we would not suggest dismantling that. I don't find that kind of analogy with all of the efforts the Federal Government is making to fight its war on poverty with its total expenditures.

There is a tendency in the Office of Economic Opportunity to do this within its own programs. However, some of them have been transferred already to other agencies. OEO has decided to delegate some of this responsibility elsewhere. Don't you agree there really isn't the kind of coordination of the efforts to help people in poverty in the Executive Branch as there is in the Department of Defense with the efforts of the military?

Mr. BOONE. I would agree. I think that the coordination of the war on poverty is much more complex, much more difficult than the coordination of the defense effort.

Mr. QUIE. Don't you agree, however, as limited as this coordination is, that the Congress needs to pursue ways to effect a better coordination?

Mr. BOONE. I would certainly fully endorse the Congress' right and responsibility to examine that question.

My own feeling, however, is that effective coordination of Federal antipoverty programs—and obviously I go beyond those directly under the responsibility of the Office of Economic Opportunity—effective coordination of those programs is going to be dependent upon the firm support of the President.

Mr. QUIE. No matter what kind of administrative changes we can write into the law, without the effective determination of the President to back this coordination, we probably would be moving in vain. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. BOONE. I am saying there is, has been, and I presume always will be a Federal bureaucracy, and that the bureaucracies are part of the Federal agencies, and while performing many, many valuable services, also in many cases they are also antcoordination. They have vested enclaves, and certainly in many cases they are not particularly willing to evaluate their own services and then act rationally and objectively upon that evaluation.

I think to deal with that problem is basically an executive responsibility, should be an executive responsibility, must be an executive responsibility if there is to be effective coordination.

Mr. QUIE. What should we do on the legislative side then—sit idly by?

Mr. BOONE. No, I have suggested some points in my testimony which I would hope you would give consideration to.

I do feel this, Mr. Quie, that at least from where I sit that one of the most effective demands the Congress could make would be for systems of evaluation and monitoring of programs and an accountability by the Office of Economic Opportunity to respond categorically to what it finds in the field.