

Following Mr. Scheuer's line of questioning, as I read it some time ago, granted that we do not have enough money to solve all the problems that are here, that are deep and grievous oftentimes, and granted that sometimes this very dispersal or fragmentation will just as well mean there will be inadequate funds going into a lot of different areas, geographical in nature, would we not do better, granted an absence of unlimited funds, to permit a State to concentrate these funds on the problems that it considered most grievous?

Mr. HOWE. This is what the Congress attempted to do, to concentrate the funds when it developed the principle of focusing on areas of high concentration of deprived students. This notion of simply turning the money over to the State for any concentration the State wished to make without any congressional direction or policy of any kind would change the total purpose and focus of title I, which is to get at a broad national problem, a national problem which really results from the fact that these students from deprived backgrounds tend to become educationally disadvantaged kids who drop out of school, who are unsuccessful, who are unemployable, who generally don't stay in the State but move about and go somewhere else, who become a charge on some other State.

The total philosophy of title I is to get at this national problem. It seems to me, if I read correctly what you are suggesting, which is simply giving the State the funds it is eligible for without focus on this particular problem, you would change the whole purpose of the act and the problem would in all likelihood go unattacked.

The States have not tended to attack the problem with funds available to them up until the time this act was placed in being. In all likelihood the pressures in the State would be very great to use these funds for purposes of raising teacher salaries generally, which is the largest financial problem the State has, and you would not be bringing special services to deprived youngsters.

So I think you are offering a very interesting suggestion about the Federal-State relationship and the funding arrangements for such a relationship, but totally changing the purpose in title I in doing so.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am not really suggesting this. I was asking for your reaction to it. Don't read into it any more than was there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Esch.

Mr. ESCH. I want to express my appreciation to you and your staff for your extent of stay and participation today. I just have one or two broad-base questions which I would like to discuss with you.

In reference to title I, granted that we need to work to improve the educational opportunity of the deprived children, I would like to discuss with you for a moment the Federal-State-local support relationship in reference, for example, to title I.

To what degree do we have information that the local districts and/or the State districts are deprived districts, if you will, that need support, as opposed to districts which, by themselves, are not giving proper or adequate support to their local programs?

To what degree are they financially or economically deprived? What information do we have?