Mr. GOODELL. I think it can be emphasized that responsible people can differ on the best way for setting up realistic programs which will help people help themselves and help those who can not help themselves. But it seems to me that one of the problems we have in society today is that these people are tired of symbols and they want some programs that have a practical effect which they can see and feel. Many of the programs we have today have mainly broken new frontiers but they need to be improved.

It bothers me a great deal that we always apparently have to paint these things in a black and white terms. If someone makes a suggestion for major changes with a view to improvement it is almost a paranoic defense. The administration and others come forward and say "You are going to destroy the program, destroy the symbol and everyone will feel we are abandoning it."

There are those in Congress who want to abandon it and kill it. Some of us who do not want to abandon it resent these allegations when we offer a program that will get $3.5 billion committed to this program, about half of it Federal money and a very large amount of private money through the inducements which we have devised along with new suggestions for getting more State and local money. It does not seem to me that it is a valid statement to say that our proposals would be destroying the war on poverty.

Reverend SCHULZ. I would like to speak in answer to that, sir. I feel very strongly that the proposals which you have put forth in opportunity crusade would have merit, given a society of people who were as concerned about dealing with this problem as you are. But society is not that way. Those of us who have been deeply involved in poverty programs across this country see many, many places where the suggestions which you have made in this proposed bill just could not possibly be worked out to the benefit of the people who are really poor.

I would be the first to say there are a lot of places in this country where the poor have not benefited from the program that now exists and that is something we have to deal with.

Mr. GOODELL. Which aspects are you specifically talking about? Which aspects are not being utilized?

Reverend SCHULZ. I think that any time we turn over direction of programs to help poor people, minority group people, powerless people to State agencies or local agencies for their development of a program in terms of the type of control——

Mr. GOODELL. Most of ours do not. We have programs to induce the States to begin to come in. We have bonus proposals for States which are willing to and can get additional money for matching it at the State level. The community action program does not go through States. It remains a Federal to local program. This is where most of your innovation is. The Head start program does not go to States. It goes to the Office of Education through a broadly representative new board at the State level broadly representative of public, private, public health and welfare and community action agencies and then to the community action agency, not to the school system. It is handled once again under contract. I would like to know which program you are talking about. The industry-labor program is given to the Labor Department. A very nice generality which is being repeated. I am afraid some of you have seen the generality without looking at the depth of what we are referring to.