

On this point, am I correct in assuming that only 17,000 out of some 27,000 school districts are being funded under title I, and that only some \$200 million at the moment is scheduled to be spent in our major cities?

My question would be this: Is it wise or privy to shortchange the youth of America because of the war in Vietnam, even indirectly, and isn't there a need for full funding of this program, particularly in the cities and in the ghetto areas where the need is clear and present?

I would think \$200 million would hardly fund this area in the cities, nor the amount that you have of some \$1.2 billion, where we have our most serious need for the disadvantaged throughout the United States.

Is there a budgetary reason why you have to do this? Shouldn't there be strenuous efforts to fully fund it?

Mr. HOWE. I think there is a need for the orderly expansion for this program in the light of the availability to local school districts of people to do the kinds of things that the program commands. I think we can perhaps argue over whether the rate of expansion we have proposed is the right rate of expansion.

I presented testimony here last year to the effect that full funding of the total authorization would create a situation which would mean, in all likelihood, unwise expenditure of funds. I still believe that is the case.

Were we to go to total authorization, we would find it impossible, in a local school district, to handle the focus on the deprived child with the right kind of people to do the job, and we need to expand the program on a basis which makes it possible to do that.

The program has never been seen by us, or as far as I know by its congressional sponsors, as a program designed primarily as a building program. It has been designed primarily as a program to provide additional immediate services, educational in nature, related to health activities and these kinds of things. It had building and equipment aspects where these might be directly related to services to deprived children.

It seems to me that at some point the Federal Government ought to consider some form of major funding for construction in elementary-secondary schools. But I don't think any of us have conceived of this program as exactly that.

Mr. REID. I just have one final comment.

What troubles me is that the various CAP programs are being cut 50 percent in the poverty program. Unless we do something more meaningful in elementary and secondary, particularly title I, I think many of the youth are going to be shortchanged and our cities shortchanged. I hope we don't do that.

Mr. HOWE. Let me add one comment, Mr. Reid, to this effect: I am sure most of the committee members are aware that we will be launching a new program in fiscal 1968 called operational follow-through. The appropriations on that will come via the Office of Economic Opportunity. This will bring about \$100 million additional into the activities of the Office of Education for the benefit of deprived children in places where title I is operating.