

Mr. JOHNSON. I seem to be evasive on that and I don't intend to be. It is sufficient to provide that. But so are many of the other kinds of things that we can do, but we just don't have funds to provide. When it comes to a matter of providing funds for this supplementary program which we can do without, and providing the salaries, the necessary funds for the teachers, we might just not be permitted locally to provide this training program for the country at large, or for the State at large.

It is this that I am referring to. It is not that I would question the validity or value locally, but it is just that we in so many instances do not have this kind of funding available locally.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Dent?

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I notice throughout the hearings there is a tendency to arrive at a conclusion that the Headstart program ought to be transferred from the act under which it is now, and put into the public school system throughout the State departments of education.

Have any of you superintendents looked up your State laws to find out whether or not you could absorb the present type of a Headstart law without running contrary to your State provisions of law?

In the last decade, we have had many reforms in education in our State and others where we have set up pretty strict rules on teacher qualifications, classroom compositions, and other restrictions that are not inherent in the Federal participation in that program, and also the Teacher Corps program, and others.

If we suddenly dumped Headstart onto the State departments of education all over the country, how many States would have to have enabling acts immediately for them to absorb this program? I know that we would have to have it in my State. We could not absorb this program as it is now constituted.

First of all, we do not interfere with State regulatory bodies in the application of the State laws. I don't think you can absorb the Headstart program as it is now operating into your State systems entirely without Federal participation in the program, and with the overriding Federal hand on it. I don't think so.

Maybe you can answer that, Mr. Johnson. You were the first one who made the positive statement that Headstart should be transferred directly and bodily over to the State departments of education.

Mr. JOHNSON. Sir, I hedged a bit and said if those departments could take it, the proviso be made if they couldn't either through the Constitution or through legislation, that it could go somewhere else. Of course, we do speak from knowledge of our own State.

In spite of the desirability that we would like to know the laws of the other States, in many instances we don't. In our own State, for example, we could, legally and otherwise, accept this proviso.

I would feel unless there is provision against it, as was indicated when Mississippi was mentioned, I would make the proviso that I would want this program available since it is extremely valuable and some loophole might be made if the States and local districts were unable or unwilling to accept the program.

Mr. DENT. Of course, that would make it sort of a hydra-headed monster. We would be running a program in one State and across