

By contrast, I call to your attention the experience of Cincinnati. Cincinnati has a board of education which has been more courageous than we have had in Cleveland and has put the question: Shall there be compensatory education, shall the voters of Cincinnati provide extra money to spend on the inner city child?

Cincinnati did provide that money, but as a result, in the November election this fall and in a followup election held in December, the voters of Cincinnati rejected a 4-mill operating levy in the Cincinnati School District by the same 2-to-1 majority that the voters in Cleveland were approving the 4-mill operating levy which we presented to the voters.

I suggest there is a lesson to be drawn from this experience, a rather sad experience, if you will, but a true one. The fact of the matter is that about all you can expect the big city school districts in this country to do by local effort is to try to catch up to the suburbs, to try to provide the same quality of education for every child as is available in the suburbs. They can do a little more, they can provide some money for the extra costs of educating the inner city children, but if we are serious in the United States about providing equal educational opportunity for all, which means providing more expensive education for inner city children than we do for the average child, the extra costs must come, most of them, from either the State or the Federal Government—now the State government.

There are several States in this country I am glad to say which do provide some money for the extra costs of disadvantaged children. Connecticut is one, Pennsylvania is another. The Governor of Ohio is interested in the big city problems and I am hopeful that Ohio will join the list this year. The most we expect to get from Ohio is some amount which will average out to \$50 or \$75 or perhaps \$100 for each of the 70,000 disadvantaged children that we have in Cleveland. It costs \$600 to run a Headstart program the way we do it, it costs \$1,200 to do it the way private organizations do it.

The amount of money that we will get from the State, while it will be helpful, will not do more than add a little bit to what we already have. We are now getting about \$70 from the Federal Government for each disadvantaged child. The amounts that we need and the amounts that we can profitably use are very much larger.

In 1966 the Cleveland Board of Education spent wisely and well every dime of the approximately \$6 million which we got for the education of disadvantaged children through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and through the Economic Opportunity Act.

In the current fiscal year we don't know exactly how much money we are going to get as yet. It will not be more than we received in 1966, it may be less. It results in a smaller rate of expenditure this year than we had last year for these programs because in 1966 we received the money rather late in the year and therefore we spend it at a monthly rate which is more rapid than we are spending this year.

Therefore, the fact is that in Cleveland we are now conducting compensatory education programs at a lower scale than we were a year ago.

In 1968 if the budget proposal which is before the Congress is approved and if the Perkins-Quie amendment becomes effective, the result