

available and to get the people and the jobs matched so that an individual can market his skill and go to work and earn his money and support his family and be taken off the relief rolls.

Mr. QUIE. We did a job but I do not believe you could say it was a great job, could you, of matching jobs with people? We still don't know the jobs that are available and the Department of Labor has not given us a list of jobs that are available and where these people are on a national basis.

Mr. STIMBERT. On a national basis, no, but on the local level it has been done to a fairly successful level.

Mr. QUIE. What if we upgraded education as we in the 1963 act did and put this money in vocational education rather than MDTA? That is another "iffy" question, but what do you think about that?

Mr. STIMBERT. I, personally, would have favored that approach. I still think it would call for a high level of cooperation with the Employment Service and you would certainly have to have the surveys of the labor market.

I do not see the school system with a wall built around it and not serving its communities. I would still have to have these communicative devices between the school system and business and industry to be served but I would favor the suggestion you just made.

Mr. QUIE. Under MDTA, a great amount of the training occurs with on-the-job training. Do you think the vocational education would have gotten along with no OJT program rather than under MDTA?

Mr. STIMBERT. My own personal opinion is it would have gotten along better. This is a certain local comment and perhaps it would not have national implications but I think it would have been more effective.

Mr. QUIE. Some now want to transfer Headstart to HEW.

Now, witnesses have come to us through the many days of hearings and said they wanted Headstart transferred to the Office of Education.

Is there some significant reason why you say HEW rather than OE?

Mr. STIMBERT. Probably many significant reasons, but No. 1, again, I think that in Headstart we have had, if I may be so bold as to say so, almost a parallel system of education setup which I think, if I am to reflect the attitude of our public at least, is not a desirable way to insure the effectiveness of public education in the days ahead and we see this running through some of my thinking.

Here is an educational program and it does not belong in a new organization. It does not belong in parallel personnel set up to do the job. It belongs in the U.S. Office of Education and a Headstart program is very definitely tied to the first grade or to kindergarten, depending on what you have previously in your school system.

Mr. QUIE. You meant the Office of Education when you said HEW?

Mr. STIMBERT. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. You might still favor a parallel education systems?

Mr. STIMBERT. What pages was that? We will make the correction. It should have been BUS Office of Education.

Mr. GIBBON. I know that 78 percent of the people enrolled in Headstart programs were enrolled in this type of program in private institutions and not in public educational systems. I wonder, with the public educational institutions as strapped as they are for classrooms