

If that transfer were to be accompanied by the infusion of \$10 billion for example, a year, which would be a symbolic gesture. That would symbolize a brandnew attack, a more comprehensive attack. If it were to be accompanied by some important significant new proposals, if it were to be accompanied by the passage of rent supplement, of antirat legislation and a host of other things, improvements of social security amendments—

Mr. GOODELL. Let me question you on that. You have raised another point. Under the present community action program, rat eradication functions are eligible for funds from OEO.

Any local community action program can have a rat eradication program with funds 100 percent from OEO if that is the local priority.

I am very much for rat eradication. They have programs in many of our biggest cities that were started under the community action program. I do get concerned that when we have a problem and it is a very serious problem, and I deplore the fact that it was ridiculed and laughed at on the House floor but I get concerned that as a solution somehow we jump to the magic of bringing in a bill, setting up a new program, a new subagency to administer it and specific categorical grants so we can apply for a rat eradication program there.

Why can't this be handled by local community action agencies who set the priorities and decide that rats are a serious problem to our people. Why cannot the local poor in the slums say that is one of our highest priorities?

Why do you need a new categorical program with only \$20 million in it which is totally inadequate to do the job? It just gives the impression you are going to do something when you are not. This again contributes to the cycle of cynicism, frustration and resignation of the poor themselves.

Rabbi HIRSCH. I don't know the answer to that. I am not that much of an expert on rats or on the legislation. I think it can be done under the local community action program.

I was in the middle of proper oration and you cut me off but I wanted to indicate that the passage of the administration's proposed legislation is not nearly enough.

It certainly is not adequate to do the job. It is not even symbolic, I would say.

Mr. GOODELL. You say if we go to the \$3.6 billion.

Rabbi HIRSCH. We talk in this testimony about \$3.6 billion. I don't think that means too much, frankly, if it is not accompanied by a whole host of other acts, and I don't see too much prospect for those other acts.

Yesterday the President called for prayer this Sunday. Well, we believe in prayer, those of us here. I just told a few of the fellows outside earlier that my first reaction when I heard that call was to remind myself of the story in Exodus where the children of Israel leave Egypt and they come to the Red Sea and Moses looks up to God and he calls on God to help and asks for salvation.

God turns to him and says "Whyfore cryest thou to Me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."

Mr. GOODELL. Isn't that the point where God opened the Red Sea for them and they went forward?

Rabbi HIRSCH. According to legend God opened it only after they had gone up to their nostrils so we have to take the first step and I