

Chairman PERKINS. I think the committee will keep you here, as many of you as can possibly stay, perhaps until 5 o'clock. We will return about 1:30 when we recess.

Mrs. GREEN. I will pursue that question, if I may, this afternoon.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Erlenborn?

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just as soon pass at this point.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to discuss with the panel, while you are here, the appropriations problem that we seem to be facing in this legislation.

The administration representative testified before this committee, and we know that the budget request for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year will be \$1.2 billion, as contrasted with the amount we authorized for fiscal year 1968 of \$2.4 billion.

A quick check with the pencil will show you that is a \$146 million increase if we get 100 percent funding of the request for funds. I made a quick calculation on the States that you gentlemen represent. Taking, as an example, California, in 1966 California had \$79 million as an entitlement and we actually gave you \$67 million. In 1967 we had an \$111 million authorization from this committee and you actually got \$74 million.

For fiscal 1968 we would have given you \$138 million, but you will receive \$74,577,000, or \$217,000 more than you received last year.

In the States of Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, you will receive not one penny more than you received in fiscal year 1967. In the State of New York, you will receive \$339,000; in Maryland you will get \$44,000; and in the State of Texas, out of that \$146 million, they will get \$14,007,000, and the State of Tennessee over \$10 million.

This indicates that not very much of the \$146 million increase is going to several of you gentlemen present this morning. The question really is: Assuming that at this level of funding what we are really going to do is give you what you had in 1967, what does this mean to you in terms of carrying on the ongoing program that you have undertaken?

Mr. DONOVAN. If we are merely going to be funded at the same amount that we were funded at for the past year, it does not mean that we are going to maintain status quo. It means we are going back. We are going to retrogress.

In the first place, our costs go up each year a few percent. We can't help it. It is the automatic moving up of all the costs of programs that we have. If you are going to take that amount of money and spread it over a number of other matters, it is not going to help us at all.

I feel that that kind of an appropriation is going to be a bad blow to the conduct of these programs in the big cities.

Mr. DALLARD. For the big cities and the smaller cities.

There is a certain amount of disenchantment occurring now. In the first year there was a short operation and everybody accepted that it was going to be better next year. But it hasn't been better this year. It has been worse. If we go into another year in which we have retrogression, I think it would be very destructive to the program.