an immediate problem of whether those many, fine, existing programs could continue to operate if the Office of Education were making the grants.

Secondly, the Office of Economic Opportunity, I think, has been in the position, through the authorizations of this committee and the Congress, to provide a good deal of direct assistance and to be directly influential on the way in which programs are operated to a degree which is not customary in the Office of Education. We have been able to target funds specifically into areas which appear to have the greatest need, to provide specialized assistance to those communities which needed assistance to get off the ground. It is a question of whether the Office of Education would be in a position to do the same thing.

In the case of the private schools, as my earlier remarks indicated, there are about 10 percent of the programs that are now operated by private or parochial schools, and there is, of course, a question as to whether and under what conditions it would be possible for those schools to continue their operation.

I think the Office of Education in its testimony last Friday made it rather clear why they thought it was important that this program remain in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Chairman PERKINS. There has been close coordination and cooperation between your Headstart program and the funds that have been expended by the Office of Education for a similar purpose, the present school program.

Mr. SUGARMAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. In fact, there are a number of situations in which parts of the funds are provided under title I, and parts of the funds are provided by Headstart. We have a number of joint publications. People involved in title I programs have taken advantage of the Headstart training programs, and our regional training officers also conduct training for title I programs whenever they are asked to do so.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr.Quie.

Mr. SHRIVER. May I make a further comment there?

Chairman PERKINS. Yes; go ahead.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I tried to point out quickly here, in response to a question similar to the one you asked, why it is that we have thought of Headstart as being a community action program. Perhaps it would be well for the record at this point to reiterate some of those factors, because, regardless of where Headstart goes, in my judgment it ought to be part of community action rather than part, let's say, of a health service or the education service or some other specialized service. I say that because Headstart has been one of the most effective community action weapons or devices that we have had. In fact, today, right now, there probably are as many as 100 community action agencies which still have only Headstart as their program.

Let me go back a step in the history of Headstart and point out how we got it going. First of all, it was not undertaken as an educational program exclusively; never was. The objective of Headstart was to, first of all, prepare the child, but in reaching the child to do something about the family and to do something about the cultural conditions in which that child grows up.