

Mr. COHEN. I think we need some more studies like the Wolfe study.
Representative SCHEUER. Yes.

Mr. COHEN. We need them either to confirm or replicate or diversify our experience. If what the Wolfe study shows is correct and if Congress believes that it is so, I would hope that then in the next 5 years Congress will put much more money into title I for this purpose.

Representative SCHEUER. My question would be this: Don't we know enough to know that we could invest far more resources in this continuum of Headstart and followthrough? Isn't there enough evidence that this does make a qualitative difference in the way the kids catch on in school, and if we consider that the billion dollars that we spent on title I was, in itself, only perhaps a 2- or 3-percent increase in the elementary and secondary school budget, the \$135 million that we are talking about for followthrough for the first couple of grades is really trivial in scope. Why aren't we doing a better and a bigger job?

Mr. COHEN. I think there is another factor though, Congressman Scheuer, that enters in. The Coleman study on the equal opportunity, and other studies I have seen, indicate to me that there is one other factor, and that is the home environment. The President's message, which he sent to Congress today, stresses the child and parent centers. I think that it is also important in Headstart, or followthrough programs to add a component for reaching the parents so that whatever this element, let's call it motivation for the sake of another word, that is put into both the child is also put into the parent. Educational attainment, work incentives, improvement, followthrough in the family, the child, and the community should all interlock.

Representative SCHEUER. I couldn't agree more. I think one of the things the Headstart program proved to the school system was the absolute necessity of parent attitude, involving the parents. The President's program that is coming up today is really an elaboration of the experience we learned in Headstart.

Mr. COHEN. It is.

Representative SCHEUER. My question is: taking the President's program that is coming up today, and Headstart, and followthrough as a continuum, why aren't we now devoting vastly greater resources to this program? And I will take the suggestion of Senator Proxmire as indicative of the kind of point I would like to make, where he quoted Secretary Wirtz yesterday as saying that when we invest resources in the most difficult single minority of our population, the long-term, hard-core structurally unemployed, we get it back in 2 years in welfare savings, and we get it back again, double our money, so to speak, in the first 4 years when these people are on a taxpaying status.

Now, if you can apply this kind of a cost-benefit payout of such spectacular success with the most difficult single group in our population, why can't we apply the same kind of cost-benefit analysis to the expenditures of the early years before the trouble really gets to be deeply rooted, when I think we all agree that a dollar saved now will save \$10 or \$20 later on in juvenile delinquency costs and in the costs of very expensive programs like Job Corps, when these kids get together high school dropouts and functional illiterates in 8th grade. Don't we know enough about the cost-benefit implications of these expenditures early in the child's life to feel that on an actuarial basis,