

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 241

TABLE G-1.—Federal funds for education, training, and related programs by agency—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Agency	New obligational authority			Expenditures		
	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
TRUST FUNDS						
Department of Health- Education, and Welfare:						
Social security.....	1	15	15	1	15	15
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....					-10	-37
Department of Transportation.....	2	4	6	2	4	6
Library of Congress.....	3	2	2	2	2	2
Smithsonian Institution.....	(2)	2	2	(2)	2	2
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.....	(2)	2	2	(2)	2	2
Department of Labor.....	1	1	1	1	1	1
Department of State.....	(2)	1	1	(2)	1	1
General Services Administration.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Total trust funds for education, training, and related programs.....	7	27	30	7	16	-7
Total funds provided for education, training, and related programs.....	9,595	11,202	12,375	7,320	10,010	11,002
Participation sales.....		-100	-112		-700	-1,815
Total net budget and trust funds for education, training, and related programs.....	9,595	11,102	12,263	7,320	9,310	9,187

¹ Funds appropriated to the President.² Less than \$500,000.

NOTE.—Figures in parentheses represent amounts after proceeds from loan participation sales.

Source: Special Analyses, Budget of the United States, Fiscal Year 1968, Special Analysis G.

Mr. BRADEMAs. The point is, if you look at that in both dollars and percentage terms, there doesn't seem to be much of an increase. The message is rather substantial, but the money is not very much more than you have been talking about in education.

Mr. HOWE. I think the Office of Education is the envy of some other agencies of the Government, however.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I understand. I am talking about national needs.

On title III, can you give me any comment on this question: To what extent do you find that title I applications are similar to title III applications?

Mr. HOWE. Let me ask Mr. Estes to comment on that.

Mr. ESTES. Our recent reports on all three of the titles, I, III, and V, indicate that there is a great deal of innovation in all three titles. Fifty-five percent of our title III projects during the first year related to programs for the disadvantaged.

That does not mean that they had a central focus on the disadvantaged, but they included programs for the disadvantaged children. I would say that in a number of cases there are title I projects that are as innovative and as creative as they are in title III.

Likewise, in title III we have a number of programs that we call adoptive, which are trying to upgrade the quality of education in local districts. These programs are similar to those conducted under title I.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Let me ask one more question and then stop.

Could you give me any comment on the question of the role of the States, the State departments of public education, in passing on title III projects?