

We put out a memorandum explaining what we thought were four or five alternative ways in which the representatives of the poor could be chosen legitimately and democratically in keeping with the intent of your amendment.

That was issued sometime ago. There were about five different ways. The places that you were concerned about chose one way that maybe you don't like—I don't know—but it was not an illegal or immoral or duplicitous arrangement and people under that scheme are chosen to the extent of 33 or 35 percent.

If the Congress wants to modify the law to say they must be chosen in one way that is your prerogative. We feel there are alternative ways and the alternatives that we outlined are on the record.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If my colleague will yield—they keep talking about the poor but tell us how you want these people to be chosen, do you want them elected? Do you want them selected at the townhall meetings? How do you want them selected? They always run for cover and say we don't want to tell anybody how to do it and then they come back and criticize saying we have the wrong people on the board.

Sometimes it is very hard to keep up with just what the devil they want.

Mr. QUIE. Is it acceptable for the people of the poor in the neighborhood to only dominate representatives and then the board themselves actually do the selecting or the mayor actually do the selecting? Is that acceptable under your guidelines?

Mr. SHRIVER. We have said that a convention method rather than a direct balloting system would be agreeable provided that in a neighborhood all of the organizations and people in the neighborhood were genuinely reached by advertising, word of mouth, meetings and so on.

So we do require and we try to police it to be sure that is actually done so if all of the residents of the area have really been genuinely informed, and if then in a series of conventions or gathers if they then nominate all people who are poor and all of whom live in that area and they have 30 nominees for 10 openings, we have a rule that it was not a violation of them being residents of the area—your amendment—if 10 out of the 30 were chosen by the mayor or the board itself because all of them had to be residents of the area to begin with and they were all nominated by people from the area.

Therefore, none could be construed to be chosen from above. They were nominated from below and somebody chose out of the 30. I am not trying to claim it is perfect but we were looking for alternative ways and it seems to me that it is not undemocratic.

Mr. QUIE. I think it is. I think the poor should be able to select their representatives and the rest of the people should be required to serve with them.

Mr. SHRIVER. What we have is a matter of public record. If somebody does not like what we have done they can say it is illegal or change it. All I am trying to say is we are not trying to do it wrong.

One of the things I have learned in this job is a terrific appreciation for the variety, the differences among communities across this country in all ways, about how city government, county government and all that works.

It is just not a monolith anywhere; they are all different. We have tried to be responsive to those differences and we have tried to avoid