

in that kid's health, his nutrition, in his home, in his teaching in order for there to be a spark lit, in order for that explosion of progress to take place, in order for that door to open at all? If we do less than that, aren't we kidding ourselves that any basic change is going to take place in that child?

Dr. MARLAND. You are absolutely right and the efforts show, sincere as they have been, have been so modest in their scope that very little can be proven from 2 or 3 years of compensatory education that anything is happening. These functions are not the same, they are different. They are making a difference but the differences have to be bigger and they have to last longer before something great will happen to these young people.

Mr. SCHEUER. Some of us have been thinking exactly about the point you are making and have been thinking we might set up demonstration programs, perhaps a child development center, that we would use as a model. Some of them would be attached to an elementary school and some perhaps attached to a university where we would have this concentration of services and resources aimed at the child's health, aimed at his nutrition, aimed at his home, at a total program of parent average, aimed at giving the teacher for that child the small class sizes and the teacher aide, support as well as the other social services, support that would really test whether this principle of yours and mine is valid so that we could prove that there is a threshold level that we must reach before which if we fail to reach it, very little happens, even with a fairly substantial investment but which once we do reach it, there is a tremendous cost benefit resulting from that point on.

What would your reaction be to a program that would set up a number of such child development centers, many of them associated with an elementary school?

Dr. MARLAND. I would welcome it and it is probably feasible under title III as well as I. It is the sort of thing that could be done well in cities around the country in collaboration with the school system.

Mr. KIRST. This has been a problem. There has been not enough money concentrated on any one child in order to get this total impact that you are talking about.

Mr. SCHERER. There has been a dispersion, a buckshot effect, typified by the Commissioner of Education's statement that they were spending on the Indian children x million dollars for x thousands of kids and it came out to about \$150 per child. I say if you analyze that from a cost benefit point of view, you will get a small return on your money. Perhaps if we spent \$700 or \$1,500 a year as we do on the Headstart programs, very comprehensive programs, you will get a more visible, more provable, more demonstrable return on that investment per dollar than you will spending one-tenth of that and having a trivial effect.

Dr. MARLAND. If you take the situation in Scarsdale with taxpayers willing to pay \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year for their schoolchildren and realize that those children come from the most favorable environment and need the least, and down the road they are spending \$500 for the child who needs it most. You need at least double now the amount of money spent on the deprived child in the innercity.

Mr. SCHEUER. You would favor a reasonable number of such demonstration programs that would do the full job in each of these areas