

Mr. HAWKINS. In view of that answer, it seems to me somewhat strange that the actual funding of the program has been reduced so drastically, which seems to negate to some extent the effort to make the program adequate. I have, for example, from the California Advisory Compensatory Commission their statement that in California for fiscal 1967 the program is only 67 percent of authorization, that it has been necessary to reduce the amount per child from \$252 down to \$180, and that even at that they face other reductions as a result of the fact that they have been required to advert children, that is, children of migrant farmworkers, and delinquent and handicapped youth, and also the income level has been increased.

My question is, In view of the limited funding apparently that is available, why would it not be more than desirable to concentrate on a fewer number of children and to stop liberalizing the program if the funding is not available? Why offer the prospect of reaching a large number of individuals, a large number of children, at the same time that more liberal features are being required of local agencies?

Mr. HOWE. I see your point. I will say in response to it that we have increased the total dollar amount available for the program by over \$150 million. This does not fully support exactly the same level of per pupil expenditure that we had in the previous year, but this comes very close to it. When you add to this the \$110 million which we will be putting into Operation Follow-Through, you have a major expansion of dollars and for a good many children, a major advance in per child funding in fiscal 1968.

But this does not deny, sir, that your point about some decrease per child in some places is going to occur.

Mr. HAWKINS. Do you think a reduction from \$252 for each eligible child to \$180 is a disaster? Do you think that this is sufficient to actually make the program successful so that the same conclusion will not be reached that was reached by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, that in those cities not enough is actually being expended, that the program has not proved to be successful?

Mr. HOWE. I certainly agree with the implication that we ought to hold the levels up here as best we can. I do not want to question those figures, because I am not familiar with the basis on which they are arranged. It does seem to me that it is extraordinary the way they have been computed to create that much reduction. We would like to look at them. Mr. Estes would like to make a brief comment on this.

Mr. ESTES. I simply want to point out that your observations are basically correct. We certainly concur in your conclusions. Our original request this year for \$1,070 million of the authorization amount would have resulted in very little, if any, decrease in the States. However, as a result of the amendments which moved the AFDC data up from 1962 to 1965 and in addition, when we added the foster and neglected and delinquent children, this resulted in a decreased amount.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, it is good to see you again. May I ask one specific general question first? I don't mean to put you on the spot, but I