

Mr. FORD. I notice in your testimony you lay it right on the line that you believe Headstart not only should be transferred to HEW but should become a part of title I. This is the strongest recommendation that anyone has made in this regard.

This puts you out ahead of anyone else in talking about a transfer. Do you really mean you want it to become part of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act? I am not trying to trap you. I just point out to you do you really mean it when you stop to realize that the funds in title I can only go directly to a public school agency and therefore the non-public-school agencies operating under Headstart would not be included?

Is that what you mean?

Mr. HAZLETT. You raise a point I had not given full consideration to. I was thinking in terms of objectives of Headstart compared to title I rather than the availability of funds to nonpublic agencies.

However, it would seem to me that under a public educational agency the same students would be benefited regardless of who administers the money.

Mr. FORD. Are all the children in your city in the program of the public school system?

Mr. HAZLETT. In our school system the only Headstart program is operated in our city by the public school system; yes.

Mr. FORD. You don't have any parochial schools or private agencies operating?

Mr. HAZLETT. No. The contract from the community action agency is with the public schools system to set up the Headstart programs in the entire area.

Mr. FORD. I think I should tell you that approximately 30 percent of all the Headstart programs in the country and about 10 percent of all the children who are in Headstart are not in public school agencies. In the State of Mississippi no public school agency would handle Headstart. So we set up a community action program down there in a small college in northern Mississippi which administers Headstart on a statewide basis.

If we do what you are suggesting on page 4 of your testimony we would have to do one additional thing. We would have to convince the entire Congress that we ought to take the protective language out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was a condition to our getting this legislation passed, because the church-State issue is always just below the surface around here.

But for the very restrictive language that we put in the Elementary Secondary Education Act in 1935 we would not have passed it. So there is no chance of changing that language and having a bill. This means that if we follow the suggestion you are making, and as I pointed out you go further than anyone who has suggested this up until now, by specifying that it go into the education act, we will put Headstart out of business in Mississippi, we will put it out of business on the Indian reservations, we will put it out of business in those parts of the country where the only available resources have been nonpublic or church oriented, predominantly small programs.

Though it is 30 percent of the total number of programs, only 10 percent of the children are affected. But almost all of the Headstart