almost three out of four (71.8%) were Negro. Despite the great need for vocationally trained employees, the total enrollment at the school is dropping as white pupils leave at an accelerated rate.

The provisions of this amendment may be able to provide us with the opportunity to change this trend and further implement the St. Louis Board of Education's policy of maximum feasible integration in the school.

Expanded educational opportunities for handicapped children

Each year the schools of St. Louis enroll more handicapped children than ever before. Even with about 7000 pupils enrolled in our special education classes, about 6% of our total enrollment, there are many thousands more who need these services. We estimate that the pupils now served are less than one half the number who should be served if we had the personnel to diagnose their problems and to teach them, the space for classrooms, and the necessary funds. Our costs for such programs are high:

	Annual cost per pupil
Handicapped pupils:	
Partially sighted	$1,234
Deaf—hard of hearing	1,758
Crippled	1,619
Emotionally disturbed	958
Mentally retarded	652
Socially maladjusted	788

The annual per pupil cost for regular classes is $520. When the additional services of personnel to test, evaluate and provide psychological counseling and other supporting services for handicapped children are provided, the costs become almost prohibitive. Thus it is impossible for us to provide the appropriate educational opportunity for all the children we have a mandate to serve.

I should like to make three other points. These relate to the cutback on funds, the date when funds are available, and the need for more flexible and better coordinated use of Federal funds.

Last year the St. Louis Public Schools began a series of projects under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We believe that they were well conceived and well administered. We involved many different people—citizens, parents, private school administrators, Community Action Agency personnel and we received enthusiastic reactions to our programs. People began to raise their sights and when the projects were severely curtailed last summer it was a bitter pill for them to swallow. To be specific, last year from December to August we spent $5,191,000 or about $650,000 per month. This year under the continuing resolution, under which we are still operating, we are allowed $3,900,000 or about $325,000 per month. This reduction was apparently caused by the failure of a number of Missouri school systems to participate in the Title I program last year. Because these districts did not use available funds the entire state is penalized and districts like the City of St. Louis which used their entire allocation last year have their Title I funds proportionately cut.

Construction contracts and commitments to professional personnel allowed us little choice where the reductions had to be made. Our teacher aide program was reduced from 476 to 200, and our extensive summer school program which last year enrolled almost 12,000 pupils will, unless additional funds are found, enroll only about 900 pupils.

A second problem which I know you are addressing yourselves to is that of providing the funds for operational programs well in advance of the time the money is to be used. Recruiting of personnel is heaviest in January and February. It is virtually impossible to find competent personnel in adequate numbers later in the year. The budget for the St. Louis Public Schools is made in November and December and this budget cannot anticipate Federal programs which are funded later in the year. It usually costs a school system extra money to participate in Federal programs. Some programs require local matching funds; others require indirect cost which perhaps cannot be shown by direct audit trail. It is impossible to budget the costs to participate unless the Board of Education knows what programs will later be available. This I believe has kept some school systems out of much needed Federal programs.