

year that we had a lot of what we now call unearmarked money so that when the community demand arose for Headstart we were able to meet it. Just by way of an illustration we originally projected about \$10 million for a Headstart program. In the summer of 1965, because we had the flexibility given to us by Congress we were able to take that program to an \$89 million Federal contribution that when coupled with the State or local contributions brought a \$100 million program into existence in less than 6 months. That was possible because we were able to exploit the openings.

A lot of these other programs would be substantially larger than they are if Congress had given us the money to exploit the openings but instead when you make a breakthrough and strike out to be able to go get it we had to sit back and hold back because we don't have the flexibility any more to exploit it, that has been taken away from us. That is why these programs are not as big as they could be or should be.

Mr. KLORES. In 1966 this was dramatized in the migratory program. The authorization was \$20 million and the statute permitted a 10-percent increase in any title because of the flexible funding. Mr. Shriver added \$5½ million to title II for all migrants so that our program went from \$20 million to \$25½ million, and then provided \$10 million from discretionary funds, so the \$20 million could be increased to \$35 million because there was discretion and we struck oil and found people who were ready to do it and suddenly the applications started to come in.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Shriver, to refer to the statement made earlier comparing the provisions in the opportunity crusade and existing law. As I read the program which you are carrying out now you had considerable expertise in reaching these migrants. As you said, you developed this and it took you some time to set the right pace but you are now reaching these people and reaching them effectively, is that correct?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes; it is. We are just not reaching enough of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It would seem to me that under the proposed substitute this whole activity would be turned over to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and we would be, in effect starting de novo on this whole thing, wouldn't we?

Mr. SHRIVER. I am not an expert on how they would think it ought to be run in the other programs. I suppose maybe Congressman Dellenback could tell you what they would do.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The reason I asked this is because in the bill before us, the administration bill, we improve and perfect your own operation but in the proposed substitute by the gentleman from Minnesota this whole program would be put it into HEW. I am hoping that somewhere along the line we are going to find out from the authors why HEW. But the fact of the matter is that because of the expert experience that you have gained in developing this, what I think is one of the most successful aspects of the poverty program, would be lost by transferring it to HEW. Would any of your witnesses care to comment on that?