Reverend SCHULZ. Most State public education agencies have done a lousy job with any type of vocational education. The whole trend of this type of movement, those States which in the past have tried to deal with some of these problems will continue to deal with these problems probably effectively and maybe Ohio and Minnesota are two of those States, but there are many States——

Mr. GOODELL. I am from New York.

Reverend SCHULZ. I am from New York. We have 900,000 functional illiterate people in New York State. We keep that down but we still have one of the best education systems in the country. What about a State that does not have the teaching resources, does not have the money or the tax base. They can't do this.

Mr. GOODELL. I wouldn't go back and forth with the dialog. We could argue this all day and all night. I fully agree with you that many States have been deficient in their approach to education and I would include New York in this because no State has achieved perfection by a long shot. There are many new innovations that take a while to get into a school system.

The point that I want to get across, however, in our proposal is not just to hand all of this over to the State school system or to the existing agencies at the local level. We even provide for a bypass of those States in those localities that are not doing the job. I just want to be sure that on the record there is full understanding of just what our proposal entails.

Rabbi HIRSCH. What is your proposal exactly, Mr. Goodell, in connection with the Office of Economic Opportunity itself?

Mr. GOODELL. Our proposal would transfer the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Community Action phase and the VISTA phase into a new division of the HEW with an Assistant Secretary at its head. This, presumably, would be called Community Development, Community Action, or whatever else. We would strengthen the requirements for involvement of the poor at the local level in the Community Action agency and in the neighborhood boards. We would put in a number of guidelines. It would be administered from HEW directly to the Community Action board established under the present law at the local level. The State would not be involved.

In addition there would be $100 million for what we call a bonus program to match any State money if a State wants to put more into community action than is available in our total appropriation.

We would completely unearmark the Community Action funds. There would be no earmarking for narcotics or legal services or all of the other things down the line. This would be a matter for the local Community Action agency to determine to set its priority, to try to get coordination which we feel is sadly lacking.

In the present program we would set up a new Council of Economic Opportunity Advisers in the Office of the President. They would be advisers to the President. It would be three men comparable in stature and pay to the present Council of Economic Advisers. We would give them an ample amount of money and they would be charting the course of the war on poverty, completing the data and information needed, doing the research and contracting for the research which is needed. This would give it a very high level in Government, right on the side of the President, recommending to the President and Congress ways of