

not have sufficient staff. If that had been administered through CAP, I think these people would have felt they were more a part of this program.

Mr. QUIE. It was interesting to me that I find the bureaucracy in OEO much more difficult to cut through than HEW. We have just an impossible time. Take, for instance, a program in my district where the Indian Bureau had been funding transportation for Indian children. They told them in May 1966 they were going to quit funding it because the money is available through OEO or the Office of Education. So they put in a request in August 1966 to OEO but they never got the money, they were only dragging along. They were finally funded after I took it up here on the record, just about a week and a half ago. This has happened over and over again—fantastic—and our records are just replete with that fouled up chaos in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. GOODELL. I might say you wouldn't get many defenders of the bureaucracy in HEW, but you will get fewer defenders in Congress for OEO. We can't get answers from them. One moment they indicate you are going to get so much money and then it is changed. They do it by telephone. They don't have an administrative procedure that anybody can understand. There is conflict within the agency. They are still doing crash programs on an idea that confuses innovation with spontaneous spending and this has us in Congress really worked up. You talk about symbolism. If we are to have the amount of money going to help the poor, that I think we would agree is going to be eventually necessary, we must have an agency administering this program which has the confidence of Congress and the American people, not just a symbol to the poor that it is going to stand up and fight for them. That agency at the moment, and it is going to take a long while to resuscitate their image, is not OEO.

Rabbi HIRSCH. That is the heart of the issue and let me address myself to that. I think it is true that any institution sooner or later develops bureaucratic mannerisms, including our religious institutions, I will submit.

It is also true as you have maintained that if Congress and the Nation had the will, we could perform the same job under any rubric whether it is a new agency or an existing agency. I think the thing that disturbs me, and I think I can say "us," you have indicated that the poverty program is not in good shape in terms of the moral support that it has from the public at large. If I were convinced that the program that you gentlemen have formulated would, in effect, launch a broad, new comprehensive offensive against poverty, which offensive would be able to gather the support of the American people, then I think there is something to talk about.

But, if as it is, being interpreted in many quarters and maybe partially it is the fault of those who do the interpreting, and maybe it is partially due to the fault of those who do not want to hear. I am willing to concede, as you indicated earlier, that there are both political and practical problems involved in that; but when your program is presented, it is interpreted in many quarters as being a way of cutting up the agency, diminishing its suggestion and, in effect, cutting down on the war against poverty. I know that is a problem we have to fight about.