

when you get down to the rural areas some of the figures would be more of a guess, so the figures would not be absolutely provable as a precise amount but we could come close. In places like Detroit, Chicago, and places like that we could come to it right on the nose.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As we listen to the debate develop here on this poverty program, our colleagues on the other side would have you believe that somehow this is a big Federal program with the Federal Government injecting itself into community after community and just running the whole program. It seems to me that, if I read your statement correctly, what you are doing is trying to respond to the requests being made by the local governments.

They administer these programs. They are the ones who originate the programs and manage and administrate them.

Mr. SHRIVER. Your basic approach is accurate. We are not saying to, say, Minneapolis that it has to have some one thing or another, but we try to respond to what they say they need.

Among some 20 places there are small places like Pueblo, Colo.—now, we could supply that right now. I think the important issue here is twofold, one the issue that you brought up. I think it is very important and I agree.

The second issue is this: Sometimes some people say that you have invested, let's say, \$20 million in the ghetto area of Detroit and yet there was a riot. Obviously the \$20 million must have been misspent or ineffective; otherwise, there would not have been a riot.

I think, in addition to that kind of approach, one has to stop and reflect for a minute on what the genuine need would be for the downtown area of Detroit, let's say, as compared to what we were able to put in. I think that the mayor of Detroit or the mayor of any big city, and I don't care what city and I don't care of what party he is a member, to come in here and tell you just what we have been able to do with the programs we have does not begin to touch what he wanted from the programs we have.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is the important thing.

Mr. SHRIVER. \$20 million is a lot of money, but \$20 million is very little money when you consider the aggregate of the needs of those central cities just for our programs, regardless of other people's programs. I must say sometimes you read about the fire on the aircraft carrier, the *Forrestal*. I said it cost \$70 million. The legal services program even expanded for next year is only a \$47 million for all of the needs of justice for all of the poor and you cannot help but feel sometimes it is a tragedy that sometimes we lose \$70 million out there and over and above the loss there is a tragedy that that amount of money could be so profitably used for the poor.

Chairman PERKINS. Let's talk about the health program for assistance under title XIX.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, before you go into that, I would like to ask one question along the lines of questions raised by Mr. Pucinski. How much would it have been necessary to spend in Detroit to have prevented to riot?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't know that. I suppose the best person to answer that is the mayor of Detroit.

Mr. QUIE. Or Rap Brown.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is not a fair statement. Rap Brown is an idiot who should be sent to Maryland to stand trial and I hope he gets the