

My first experience with the Detroit program is that it has been relatively trouble free. A thousand CAP programs across the country have had enough publicity to slow down the rest of the problems in New York, Boston, Los Angeles, and I can't pick the fourth one quickly, I hope in judging the cooperation between the educational system and the community action program that you will look out to the experience of some other large cities across the country, and I am not even prepared to guess why it is working in Detroit and not in Cleveland, New York, Los Angeles, and in other places.

I leave that to the people who know that area better but I hope in considering the value of the respective programs that we are dealing with at the Federal level you look to the experience of other cities other than your own.

As an outsider—Mr. Scheuer can't say this and he might take issue with me—your record in New York is not distinguished in that regard.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, Dr. Bowman, Mrs. Levin, and Mrs. Benjamin. I thank all of you for appearing here on a Saturday especially. You have presented some excellent testimony. I again want to thank Congressman Scheuer for having the foresight and vision for inviting you people from the great State of New York.

Mrs. BOWMAN. We thank you for the opportunity.

Chairman PERKINS. If there is no objection I would like to insert in the record at this point a statement of Mr. Joseph D. Lohman, chairman, California Advisory Education Commission, 721 Capital Mall, Sacramento, Calif., along with a letter I addressed to Congressman Moss and an article in the Carnegie Quarterly.

(The documents referred to follow:)

MARCH 17, 1967.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I appreciate very much your communication of March 14 which I received this morning. I am very grateful for your thoughtfulness in furnishing me with a copy of the statement of Joseph D. Lohman, Chairman of the California Advisory Compensatory Education Commission. The proposed funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as reflected in the administrative budget is, as Dr. Lohman points out, substantially below the authorizations provided by Congress in extending the Act last year, PL-89-750.

I strongly favor a full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, particularly in Title I, and I intend to make my views known to the House Appropriation Committee at the appropriate time in connection with its consideration of the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the meantime, I shall be most pleased to make Dr. Lohman's statement part of our current hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1967.

Warm regards.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH D. LOHMAN, CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COMPENSATORY EDUCATION COMMISSION, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

When Congress passed the 1966 amendments to ESEA Title I, it authorized \$1.45 billion, which would have meant about \$110 million to California. But the President only recommended, and Congress passed, an appropriation of \$1.05 billion, or 80 percent of the authorization. And while Congress' 1966 amendments to the authorization bill provided that additional children receive ESEA Title I services, the appropriation bill did not include the \$123 million authorized