

Chairman PERKINS. Last year we raised the income level limitation effective, I think, in fiscal 1968, including the migrant workers and dependent children of military personnel overseas, and the handicapped.

If I read your estimates correct, title I for fiscal 1968 would take approximately \$2,400 million.

Here is a problem that faces us now. The school people over the country will not be knocked over the heads with this. They may have to cut back now and reduce their personnel. If I read the budget estimates correctly—and I know the President of the United States is most interested because you would never be here today but for the great effort that he put out in behalf of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—if I read the budget figures correctly, we only have \$1,240 million, which is approximately 50 percent of the funds necessary to carry on this program during fiscal 1968, and especially considering the great demands on fiscal 1967 when we spent \$1,053 million, as you just stated.

Do you propose later on to recommend a supplemental, or to make a request of that kind, so that this program can be properly funded?

Mr. HOWE. Mr. Chairman, let me comment on this.

First of all, the history of the appropriation for title I is that in the first year of it we had appropriated \$959 million. In the second year, \$1,053 million. We propose for fiscal 1968 \$1,200 million, so that we have in the funding of this particular title a slow but steady increase in the total amount of funding.

In direct answer to the second portion of your question, we do not intend to bring up a supplemental for title I in fiscal 1967. It might help our interpretation of this if I were to ask Mr. Estes, on my right, to comment on the distribution among the States of the \$1,053 million we have for fiscal 1967 and the effects of this on the program.

Mr. ESTES. I would just add that the \$1,200 million that will be requested for fiscal year 1968 represents approximately a 13-percent increase over fiscal year 1967. We anticipate that this will provide for approximately 700,000 additional disadvantaged children.

We are convinced that this is an appropriate increase in our program. During the past year, fiscal year 1966, 41 percent of our funds went for teaching personnel; perhaps more of it would have gone for teacher personnel if teachers had been available.

So in answer to your original question, we would submit that the increase is appropriate, perhaps as much as can be absorbed by local educational agencies during fiscal year 1968.

Chairman PERKINS. As you know, we set this program up in rather a hurry. We had difficulty getting many people to comment on the program. Now they are in the program and they have gone to great trouble to provide compensatory quality educational programs. It has just started to take hold.

If we, in effect, cut this program back, we are going to frustrate and confuse the school systems of this country, and set back Federal aid to education some 10 or 15 years, in my judgment.

I make that observation because I have been working on this subject for 19 years that I have been in Congress. I just don't see how we can afford to dilute and cut back our program at this time, notwith-