

don't think we have even gotten our feet wet, to continue the analogy and to continue the metaphor. I think it is about time we started moving forward in to those wastes.

Mr. GOODELL. I would agree we must move to the point where we get something higher. The President has moved to a billion dollars. He said we are not taking money away from the war on poverty because of the war in Vietnam. We are not sacrificing programs for the poor because of the war in Vietnam and this has been repeated by a great many others. I think the fact is without any question that when we are spending \$30 billion a year in Vietnam with the fiscal situation the way it is, you are not going to appropriate \$3, \$4, \$10 billion for a war on poverty.

But I will give you another fact from my judgment that you would not increase to that level in this Congress today if there were no war in Vietnam, if the money were given to OEO. This is the point I think that has to be understood by some of those who want an escalation of the war on poverty when the time comes when we do have the money.

It has to be escalated through agencies in which Congress and the American people have some confidence. It cannot be escalated by just handing it back to the same sort of programs.

Some of us are trying to provide the transition that we feel is necessary here to permit that.

Reverend SCHULZ. We appreciate your candor, Mr. Goodell. I think the thing that I would like to leave is if we think about this in really honest psychological terms, in terms of the psychological effect that all of this has on people and so on, we have to realize that most poor people understand the political implications of what is going on in the Congress vis-a-vis programs designed to assist them, and even if they don't understand the implications they know enough to know that if you rock the boat too much you might fall out and with things as they are, even though they are not as good as they might be, it might be better than they will be, and when the Government itself is asking for \$2.6 billion, this sounds better than \$1¾ billion even though I admit you have said this could be expanded or doubled.

Mr. GOODELL. It is \$2.06 billion.

Reverend SCHULZ. I feel very strongly about two things. Many of the poor, and obviously we have not talked to the same people, even though they have problems with Federal bureaucracies and so on know there is a relationship between their problems and the field staff of OEO, CAP agencies, district people and so on. They have never had that feeling with any other Federal agency.

People in the South never even knew, many of the poor people, knew there were extension services there, but now they know there are some poverty people in the South where they have allowed it to operate. I think with all of the feeling of depression and frustration and so on, I think it is important that we not turn this aside for political reasons. We have to move ahead.

I don't think we have given it enough of a chance. I think there is real hope here. I would be the first one to admit there have to be changes and there is documented evidence in writing.

Mr. GOODELL. Why do you say the changes are for political reasons?

Reverend SCHULZ. I think it is rather obvious.