

coordinating the existing programs, strengthening those that deserve strengthening, and eliminating those that deserve elimination.

That is basically what we would do with OEO.

Rabbi HIRSCH. I was familiar with the broad outlines of it and I appreciate your refreshing our memory on it.

To get back to my comment which originally stimulated your comment about the symbolic significance. Neither our groups individually nor our groups collectively in the Interreligious Committee Against Poverty have taken any specific positions on specified delegations of authority. When I talked about symbolic significance, I think we have taken a position on that; namely, that we think there is great virtue and great advantage in the fact that there is an agency that can be more or less called the headquarters of the war on poverty. The thing that we are concerned about in connection with your proposals is to transfer this agency which has, despite the many problems and in some instances the legitimate criticism of the agency, has nevertheless drawn to the public attention the fact that there is such a phenomenon as poverty in our society and has also stimulated discussion and in some instances many fine programs to ameliorate that poverty.

To take that agency and transfer it and make it a subdivision of an existing agency, we feel, would be to diminish the significance of the agency. That is the part that I was referring to earlier.

Mr. GOODELL. What function do you think the Health, Education, and Welfare Department has? If I had to sum up the problems of poverty I would sum them up in Health, Education, and Welfare. One of the reasons we want to transfer this to that agency is not only to give it the coordination with existing programs in this field but also to begin to induce into those existing programs, spending anywhere from \$45 to \$50 billion, depending on how you set your standards in poverty-oriented programs, this concept of the involvement of people themselves into those existing programs.

If we can't begin to transform the approach of HEW where we are spending all of this money, most of it coming out of HEW, we feel we are going to fail. So let's start doing that and let's make HEW the headquarters for this.

Mr. HAITHCOCK. I think that is one reason our contention is against the dismantling of the OEO. You have had an experience here of innovation and experimentation that you are saying you are going to now apply and put a program into an established agency. That is our contention of keeping OEO intact because of that basic innovation and experimentation and demonstration it has been so successful that has contributed to the development of Headstart.

Without that preliminary demonstration and research which was attributable to OEO and the impetus that was given through OEO it would not have been possible. It had not happened before in the educational or health agencies.

Mr. GOODELL. That is a good, valid point that we have had some innovation in OEO that we did not have in these particular areas before. But let me say that this is not conclusive at all in terms of what these agencies can do. We have had multiple examples, of innovation in existing agencies when the President and Congress have requested and given them the charter and the direction to do this.