

progress in funding in the total support of the schools in the current fiscal year.

Mr. BURTON. In other words, if I might terminate this dialog now, you are telling this committee despite the fact the Congress changed the formula, because you ignored our mandate a few years ago, you are refusing to seek to get funding for it?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, may I clarify this point? This question was asked yesterday.

Mr. Burton, yesterday, I believe, this question, or the day before yesterday this question was asked. They are going to try to, according to the gentlemen here, they are going to try to get that AFDC data brought up to date. But the problem was that we passed the bill out too late last year, as I recall it.

Isn't that accurate?

Mr. ESTES. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. They are going to bring the data up to date but no money to implement the policy. Commissioner Howe said they have no funds to fund this policy. The data will be up to date, but there will be no money to back it up.

Mr. HOWE. As I stated, Mr. Bell, we have no present plans for a supplemental appropriation.

Chairman PERKINS Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am happy to see you here, Mr. Secretary. I think I should tell you, however, that as a person who considers himself a strong friend of this legislation that I am terribly disappointed in your recommendations from the Department and from the administration.

For education this year, I find it extremely difficult to get excited about what looks to me to be a very, very pale view of the future of education in this country in view of the very growing promises that some of us made in selling this legislation on the floor in 1965 and 1966.

In line with what Mr. Burton has just raised, I call your attention to the fact that last year we appropriated out of the authorization of title I \$1,042 million. This year the President's budget only asks for a total of \$1,200 million, and if we got full funding of what he asked for it would be less than half of what we authorized last year in this bill for expenditure under Title I. Now here is what happens. On July 1, 1967, the beginning of that fiscal year, several things kick into gear. The first is that you will have to distribute this limited amount of money in some states on the optional basis of one-half the national average per-pupil expenditure. You will have to distribute on the formula recognizing \$3,000 as the low-income factor instead of \$2,000.

In addition to that, you will have the up-to-date AFDC data, the Indian schools, and other categories that we have. It is quite clear that if we are dealing with the same amount of money as we had last year that to put these things into effect—and you don't have much option, it seems to me—you are going to have to take some money away from people who got it last year in order to redistribute this fixed amount of money under this new formula.

My question to you is, have you warned any of the school districts across the country that were getting money under title I to expect that they are going to get cuts commensurate with the reallocation of the funds under the new formula?