

money in Headstart for fiscal 1968, leaving everything else at the level you recommend?

Mr. SHRIVER. Our position is that all of these programs are necessary. Take the health program. It would be a tragedy to cut it back in order to increase another one such as, let's say, Headstart. What we are proposing is a balanced program and that is what we want from Congress because we don't want to shortchange the legal services program or the Neighborhood centers or the Neighborhood Health. What happens is that people always want to expand one that they happen to like and cut back one that they are not interested in.

Mr. GOODELL. My question is: If everything is kept at the same level, can you responsibly spend more money for Headstart? I don't have to repeat the question.

Mr. SHRIVER. But you can't do that within the budget figures that you propose.

Mr. GOODELL. I am not proposing. I am asking you: Can you spend more than \$2 billion 60 million?

Mr. SHRIVER. Not responsibly across these programs. Within that limit of \$2.60 billion, within your limit of \$1.7 billion, it is even more irresponsible because you have to cut something back.

Mr. GOODELL. I am asking: Can you spend more than \$2.60 billion in the war on poverty in fiscal 1966? As a matter of fact, Mr. Wirtz made that statement. I didn't agree with that statement. He made it flatly, that we couldn't responsibly spend more than \$2.60 billion at the moment in this program. There are many others who disagree. Mr. Scheuer disagrees with it. I disagree in certain segments, and I would like your opinion and I think the committee would like it.

Mr. SHRIVER. I would be glad to discuss it segment by segment. What I am anxious for—and most people say you can't get even \$2 billion—

Mr. GOODELL. You are not going to get it with the kind of answer you are giving me. If we keep this money, all the other programs, right where it is, no sacrifice of any other program, can you spend more money responsibly on Headstart?

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I think he has answered.

Mr. GOODELL. Can you spend more money?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have answered the question six or seven times.

Mr. GOODELL. I think the record will show that you have effectively avoided it.

Mr. SHRIVER. You may think so, but I don't think so.

Chairman PERKINS. I hate to cut off the hearings for today, but let me again compliment you and all your associates for your appearance here. I think you personally put in an outstanding appearance and well presented your case. We will have you and your associates back at an early date.

We will continue on tomorrow and Wednesday and Thursday with the regular schedule.

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the other members of the committee for the attention you have given to our presentation. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m. the hearing was recessed, subject to call.)