

from the point of fiscal and economic policy, as Senator Proxmire pointed out, we ought to be putting vastly more resources into this continuum now?

Mr. COHEN. Although mathematical proof of it is not always down on paper to say that we know enough, I happen to believe that it is true, and as I read the material that comes across my desk, it convinces me that what I believed previously is true.

But I do think that we have to develop more concrete evidence through what I call longitudinal studies that follow the family for 15 or 20 years, to show how these increased investments in the educational system really pay off. I think they will pay off, and I agree with you the \$100 million more spent between ages three and seven has a very good payoff.

Representative SCHEUER. You wouldn't advocate that we wait until the Headstart kids from last summer graduate from graduate school to decide whether the Headstart program last summer paid off.

Mr. COHEN. No. I would prefer to operate on my biases and prejudices than wait for that statistical information to come in.

Representative SCHEUER. Good. I hope this will be translated into programmatic requests from the Congress. Just one last question, because I know the hour is getting late.

We have had two reports from the National Advisory Council on title I, two reports that I consider the most sensitive and compassionate and brilliant pieces of "governmentalese," if I may say that, that I have ever seen. They were really of the highest quality of excellence. We know how title I is functioning. We know the deficiencies, we know the pluses and the successes too. We have heard a great deal of discussion in recent months of doing away with the grant-in-aid program, doing away with the tax-sharing—the Heller program—we have heard of. Based on the successes and the failures of the title I program, which did operate through the States, what is your reaction as to whether we should continue the grant-in-aid programs with the Federal guidelines and the criteria and so forth, and some Federal presence, or do you think we can afford to wipe the slate clean and proceed with the States and the cities in these vast educational programs which we hope will be upcoming pretty soon, on a general tax sharing formula?

Mr. COHEN. Well, I have to again admit to a prejudice in answering that question. I personally favor very strongly what I call categorical programs as you might say, contrasted to something like the Heller-Pechman plan, and I favor categorical programs, because I think what they do is they establish a national priority determined by Congress as to what it thinks is important.

I am perfectly willing to admit that Congress can in its wisdom make a mistake, and be either too narrow or too limited, but I think on the whole, deciding you want to eliminate air pollution and rifling in on that objective by merging all your available resources to attack it for a period of time is certainly a reasonable decision on the part of Congress. Or trying to deal with disadvantaged children, or Headstart, or whatever else you want to deal with in the same way, because it expresses the national interest and it rationalizes resources, and it directs public attention to the problem.