

sitting here in Washington and saying everybody has to do it our way. That is why we have five or six different ways.

Mr. QUIE. One of the things people have objections to is that other people affluent in the neighborhood can't take their right of representation away from them. As long as there is some money involved we should put out guidelines protecting this.

Mr. SHRIVER. We have put out guidelines. You can obviously change the guidelines if you feel they are wrong. I take it, Congressman Gardner and Congressman Pucinski, may feel they should go the other way.

Mr. QUIE. I may have some boards who prefer to be self-perpetuating.

Mr. SHRIVER. Under the bill pending before you for about 5 months it is spelled out they can't be self-perpetuating. They have to be staggered terms. That is all in the bill. Roughly, the bill before you represents an honest attempt to deal with these problems that we are now discussing here. I honestly believe if you enact that bill you would find lots of the things you worried about would disappear.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The concept I have advocated ever since this program was started is that you have an elected official who must come before the electorate and account for his stewardship. Either he has done a good job or a bad job and if he does a bad job he gets defeated.

My colleagues have discussed this one-third rule not out of conviction but of spite that they were going to hurt somebody in the big cities.

Actually what they have done is create a great deal of unnecessary dissention in communities.

Mr. QUIE. This is the smokescreen you throw up when you want to deny some people have a right in their own program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I don't want to deny anybody a right of anything but I think whenever public funds are concerned there ought to be an accounting.

The basis of this Republic is the ballot box and I think the voters have a right to come and say you have done a good job or bad job.

I am amazed to see my great colleague who holds himself as a defender of the public does not want to go the route of the ballot box in the spending of huge sums of taxpayers' money.

They are coming and going and they can't quite make up their minds on the program.

Mr. QUIE. There have been mistakes in a number of programs that have been financed by the Federal Government. Housing is a good example. The people who were to be involved were not involved in raising and planning their own expectations.

To me this is a failing. As I have looked at the poverty program, the one thing that I felt that stood out as an ingenious device that I believed in and as I have seen it operate, even though there has been controversy about it and I believe in it, and that is the participation by the poor.

I have always felt the director should have the statutory backing. That is the reason for my amendment to make sure there was one-third representation of the poor. You have not found me critical of that in the past and until it has proven to be a failure, I shall not change my opinion.