

Chairman PERKINS. I mean, if we just turned it over to the States to handle.

Mr. BREIT. Yes. I think my own reaction would be no, that under categorical aid, where it is specified for specific uses, then you do apply it to those critical areas and you use it there. If the same amount of money that is now going into title I came as general aid, I doubt that you would get the same degree of concentration.

It probably would be spread over a wider area.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me have your comment on it.

Mr. HAZLETT. Yes, I would agree that there would not be the emphasis on educating the disadvantaged, under a general Federal aid program. It is a radical concept that is causing many of us to re-examine some of our basic philosophies, really, with respect to the possibilities of education.

Mr. STAPLETON. I would agree with my colleagues here. We obviously would still face, under general aid, the decision of priorities, and I have a feeling that there might be a different ranking of priorities, a diffusion of participation of them, which I think the majority—

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel that if we had this same amount of money going into the States from the Federal level, as complete substitute, that the State authorities would not reach the disadvantaged children to the extent they are now being reached under ESEA, and that they would spend their funds for teachers' salaries, and other State obligations and they would not emphasize the disadvantaged as they are now being emphasized under ESEA?

Mr. HAZLETT. I believe that we would not get the same kind of emphasis on the disadvantaged. There would be some diffusion.

Chairman PERKINS. Now a couple of other questions. Do you feel that we are placing this money under title I of ESEA to the greatest possible advantage at the present time, considering the needs at the elementary-secondary level?

Mr. BREIT. Yes, I think the direction of this categorical aid to the low-income-family youngsters, those of limited cultural backgrounds, is well placed. I think it is money well spent.

Mr. HAZLETT. Well, under the objective of the elimination of poverty, and providing education for these disadvantaged, I think it is being placed correctly.

Mr. STAPLETON. I believe that it is being placed correctly. I am made mindful of the fact that perhaps our district, other districts, perhaps, should view the research available today, and do a little more in terms of saturating at the earlier grades.

We have heard comments to the effect that we have had patchwork, remedial work, at later stages, in secondary, and while I believe that these programs are necessary, and that we need to continue them, and have good programs at other levels, I believe there needs to be a concern for saturation of services for the disadvantaged, under this program, at the earlier grades.

Chairman PERKINS. Is it your experience that we only have enough money for programing purposes under title I available at the present time, and do not have funds available adequate for school construction?