

Mr. ESTES. This is a point of order and your argument is well taken.

Mr. FORD. Assuming that we are talking about \$146 million increase for title I, you have now worked out the entitlements that you would have with full funding for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ESTES. That is right; total authorization.

Mr. FORD. Have you determined the difference between what you are asking for and the take-in? The figure I have is \$2,400 million.

Mr. ESTES. What the additional amount would be required for full funding of the entitlement?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. ESTES. \$2,441 million.

Mr. FORD. So we are asking for half of what our formula calls for?

Mr. ESTES. About 49 percent.

Mr. FORD. This is what leads some of us to have difficulty in trying to understand how you are going to pay everybody what they had last year and still have an increase reflected in every State, including New York.

Mr. ESTES. What we would like to do, if it is all right with you, is to submit our calculations for the record so that you can see exactly how we arrived at the allocation and the entitlement for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. FORD. Now, as a final question I just want to ask again—as I ask each year when you folks are here—whether you anticipate recognizing as educationally deprived those children who have the greater part of their education in half-day sessions, those children who suffer a major part of their education in overcrowded, antiquated, obsolete classrooms with the absence of anything approaching usable teaching laboratory facilities and those children who go to school during the major part of their career on what we call double sessions which are so common in our State that nobody ever raises an eyebrow.

It is most common, incidentally, in the suburbs; not in the core cities or the farms. All these people are moving to the suburbs who are looking for the great advantage of living there only to find that there are no classrooms for their kids.

Do you have in the hopper now a plan for meeting the problem of this group of educationally disadvantaged people?

Mr. HOWE. This group of educationally disadvantaged I agree with you about in the sense that they certainly do have an educational disadvantage. They, of course, frequently do not qualify for funds under title I because of the \$2,000 to \$3,000 eligibility arrangements and the necessity for concentrations of children from backgrounds of that kind. We don't have such suggested legislation in the hopper as you suggest. We are addressing ourselves to the problem. The problem, it seems to me is, more than anything else, a problem of funds for construction on a rather broad basis. The school districts that have the problem you are talking about tend to have low assessments.

Mr. FORD. I just looked at some figures recently that show me that 86 percent of the bond issues that were proposed in special elections across the country in calendar year 1966 were passed by the people. This really amazed me because we heard last year there was a taxpayers' revolt going on.