

Mr. FROST. May we let the lawyers speak to that.

Mr. SHRIVER. We have proposed how we think it could be best done. We are here in support of the administration bill. Deviations from it with respect to this do not have our support. We have done the best we can to write the kind of bill we think would operate the program the best.

That is why it is the way it is.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The reason I ask that is that there would be a greater contribution of funds from local communities. The pie can be cut in only so many pieces and excellent programs like this would suffer.

Mr. SHRIVER. From my own point of view I think it is a serious drawback of the program if I understand correctly, Opportunity Crusade proposes that the local share again has to be substantially increased under that bill.

I say that because most local jurisdictions and Los Angeles I think would be one, feel that local taxes are as high as they possibly can be, especially the local property taxes.

I struggled with that for 5 years when I was on the Board of Education of Chicago. It was my belief we ought to be spending a great deal more money on education in Chicago then and it probably still is true but the local tax base can't take it.

Or at least they claim they can't take it. Therefore if you raise the burden on State and local government for programs like Upward Bound by raising local contributions I personally think it will hurt the programs.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Gurney.

Mr. GURNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am interested in this 8-percent figure that we have been talking about a good deal. As I understand the testimony, 8 percent now of the children from poverty income families go to college, is that right?

Mr. FROST. Yes, sir.

Mr. GURNEY. While that is a small percentage unfortunately it does amount to a rather sizable figure. If you multiply this by your figures of 1,400,000 as a matter of fact, it is 112,000 students who apparently are going to college this year from this group.

Obviously they are getting money from other resources than their own. I suppose a great part of the money also comes from the Federal Government, the Federal education programs, and again, I suppose, from the Office of Education.

Now you have made a heavy argument here that this particular program is better handled by your agency because you know the problems better. Let us admit for the purpose of argument that that is true.

Why should not all of the moneys that are now handled by the Office of Education to help out these 112,000 students, or a great percent of that number, be transferred to the OEO program? Would you advocate that?

Mr. SHRIVER. No, we don't. As a matter of fact, 2 years ago we transferred money—

Mr. GURNEY. Why wouldn't you, if you can handle it better?

Mr. SHRIVER. We don't handle the money. That is not what this program is.