The excess shown under these projections is of the order of magnitude of about $5 billion a year in 1975. That is, continuing the trends as they exist under present law.

This is broken down in detail by the major categories.

The biggest factor accounting for an apparent change in the direction and emphasis of the outlook is the change in population. Both a decline in the rate of increase in population, and a change in the age distribution will mean a small decline in the number of children in the schools. Whereas education requirements have been rising very rapidly for an increasing student body, now the increased funds can go into essentially quality improvement.

The changing age distribution also means that the relative number of people in the over 65 group who will have to claim some aid will be much smaller in the total economy—as it will exist then. Presumably, the number having claims for aid to dependent children, that is, under 18, will be fewer relative to the size of the economy.

Representative GRIFFITHS. Excuse me.

Do you assume that the number is going to go down on aid to dependent children?

Mr. HARRISS. No.

Representative GRIFFITHS. That would be a plateau?

Mr. HARRISS. I would have to check on the actual figures. In relation to the total population it will be much smaller. The expenditures are projected to increase. I am not sure. What I am saying is that it is the smaller part of a much bigger economy. We can have it. It is all in the study.

The totals for education would rise from an average per student in 1965 of about $490 to $852. This is per child in public schools.

So that here is a substantial amount for increase in quality.

In public welfare, the increase will again be fairly substantial. The increase per capita is again shown, a rise of $46. This is per capita and not per recipient. The increase in education per capita is $94 for the whole United States, not per child in school—which was the figure I gave before.

Similarly, table 3 shows the amounts for each of the major categories, in all cases a substantial increase per person. The "other general" includes tax collection, parks and recreation, correction, unemployment insurance administration, general public buildings, general administration, and so forth.

So far as revenue is concerned, the existing revenue systems include a much bigger potential for increase than often recognized. Once again, we must remember that we start from a much bigger base, a much bigger economy, consequently, a given percentage increase involves much larger amounts in absolute terms than in the past decade.

The 1975 projections reveal State and local taxes of $414 per capita. It is almost $2,100 for a family of five.

The breakdown by revenue sources is in the table.

Now, by and large, it seems to me that the assumptions which have been used are on the conservative side, with one exception which I will note in a moment. They have tended to be conservative in projecting increases in expenditure programs, perhaps a little bit on the high side and somewhat conservative on the revenue increases from the existing system. Of course they take no account of the tax increases that have been legislated since this study was made.